

CASAN  
XC 23  
M 27



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114683642>









CAZDN  
XC 23  
-M 27

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES**

**FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES**

**THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1981**

you would be interested in developing a report on food services in the House of Commons. I believe there are many questions about what we do that could be clarified. I would like to ask Mr. Peter G. Smith, former head of the food services department.

Mr. Smith has been involved in the food services in the House of Commons for a number of years. He has been instrumental in developing the food service program in the House of Commons. He has been involved in the development of the food service program throughout the country in similar capacities.

One of the first things I would like to know is why the services in the House of Commons are close to the top in terms of cost per meal. The answer to this question is not clear.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Also taking part:

Mancini, R. (Essex South L)  
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)

Clerk: Richardson, A.

From the Office of Director of Administration:

Fleming, R. J., Director  
Perry, C., Manager, Food and Beverage Services



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, May 14, 1981

The committee met at 3:44 p.m. in room No. 228.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES

Mr. Chairman: We have a quorum. We will go into regular session.

Members will see from the agenda before them that there was one outstanding item raised in the last meeting for consideration today and that was the matter of food and beverage services. The committee will recall that it was the wish of committee that Mr. Perry appear before us today and, in the light of subsequent discussions that I have had relative to item one, it also seemed especially advisable that Mr. Fleming also be invited to attend.

If it is agreeable to members of the committee, I would recommend hearing from them at this time, rather than us firing off. I believe Mr. Fleming has a presentation to make and Mr. Perry may as well. You also have for your information a copy of the financial report which was circulated. If anyone does not have those, I am sure you will have them in a moment.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman and members, I thought that perhaps to start with it might be a good idea if we could look at the food services in the building that presently exist and possibly from the viewpoint of Colin Perry.

Colin came to the assembly about two years ago and is the first person to really reorganize the food services. He comes from a very professional background in the food services industry. I think it might be appropriate, therefore, if he could give some comments about the unusual situation that exists in the building with regard to the full range of services. I thought that perhaps you would be interested in his perspective on this.

Then I think I certainly would be ready to answer specific questions about budgets and about possible plans that we, as staff, may see for the future and that type of thing. I would like to ask Mr. Perry to just review from his standpoint how the food services are handled.

Mr. Perry: When I first came here I reviewed all the food services with regard to the facilities offered throughout the building, primarily the north wing members' lounge, the press lounge, the cafeteria and the dining room. We do food service throughout the building in committee rooms also.

One of the recommendations made was that we either improve the services in the members' lounge or close the members' lounge. The way it is at the moment, the members' lounge is open, and that

is all I can say about it. Because of the facilities there, we cannot offer a full range of services.

The access to that lounge is very poor. In the evenings when the House is in session, the members far prefer to use the press lounge, which is more convenient and much closer. So the recommendation we made was that perhaps we should close it at five o'clock and utilize the press lounge or look for a new location completely.

These recommendations were turned down by the committee. We had a survey done of members to find out what they thought of the services in the members' lounge. A number of them were satisfied with the location, they were satisfied with the service and they did not feel there should be any changes made apart from the colour television, and that is the only thing that was done.

As far as the dining room is concerned, one of the major problems with the service in the dining room is on committee days when we have a lot of members using the dining room. If it happens to rain and we get a lot of outside people into the building, then we do get a problem of congestion which sometimes slows down the service, particularly when members arrive with guests and have not reserved a table. Then they may take a large table for six when there are only two of them and they wish a private conversation. Therefore, we cannot utilize the dining room to the best advantage.

In addition to this--probably success has been the problem--we do a large number of functions throughout the building, cabinet luncheons, Speaker's luncheons. When they all occur on the same day and the dining room happens to be busy, my kitchen is far too small--it is as simple as that--which means that the service in the dining room is again slowed down.

As far as the price increases are concerned, these recommendations started with the provincial auditor who suggested that the prices were such that we should attempt to recover the total cost of the food services. However, as all members are aware by looking at the profit and loss statement, it would mean almost a minimum charge of \$5 a head for anything to try to even recover the wage cost in that service. Basically, that is it in a nutshell.

Mr. Boudria: I do not know if it is really a question, but I have a few observations I would like to make to just open it up for discussion.

3:50 p.m.

There are a couple of things I am wondering about and, as a new member, I may not yet be fully familiar with the things that are more popular and the things that are less popular. I may even disagree with many members here on them, but it just strikes me that on the few times that I have been in the lounge it seems to be used hardly at all. At the same time, there are people there in the lounge providing the service.

In my own mind, I have a hard time imagining why it is even

required. Those of us who are trying to work here on Monday night and Wednesday night cannot eat anything; even the snack bar is not open at night. Often on Monday and Wednesday nights, we go out. I see eight, 10 or 12 members going out of the door trying to find a place to eat so that we can work in the evening.

It would seem to me that staffing, manpower, would be much more effectively used for extending food service to the members, and one should just forget about that lounge altogether. It is just an observation. Maybe other members will say they use that facility every day and are really pleased with it. Those are my remarks on that topic.

In so far as the price of food is concerned, I do not think it is particularly expensive. I was asked by other members of our caucus to raise the matter of the price of liquor, which they consider to be exorbitant. Not having consumed any myself, I do not even know what it is, but many other members have complained to me about liquor being what they consider very expensive relative to other things that are sold there.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Perry, do you have a comment in response?

Mr. Perry: As far as the liquor prices are concerned, again, I was instructed to increase the prices to try to bring in a better return. If you compare them to any outside establishment, my liquor price for, say, rum and Coke or rye, is at least \$1 cheaper than most other establishments. My prices are comparable to a community college, like Seneca.

Mr. O'Neil: What is the charge, Mr. Perry?

Mr. Perry: My charge is \$1.50 plus tax, say, for a rum and Coke, and that is for an ounce and a half. Seneca College is selling it for the same price, but for an ounce measure.

Mr. Mancini: (Inaudible)

Mr. Perry: No, that is in the dining room. They have a small dining room there for faculty. If you go outside, you can pay anything from \$2.25 to \$2.75 plus tax for the same item.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Boudria, do you have any further comments?

Mr. Boudria: No, other than trying to find out the reactions of other members about what they think especially of the lounge and the value of having personnel there when there seems to be personnel and no customers.

Mr. Mancini: I would like to say, first of all, I am not a member of this committee, but I am concerned enough to come and participate in this discussion, because there are several things I find that are of concern to me and, I am sure, are of concern to just about everyone who is elected to this Legislature, in particular the members who come in from out of town and have to stay in Toronto all week long and have no opportunities to go home

and must therefore depend a great deal on the services which are provided by the assembly.

First of all, I must get the issue out in the open right away. I am concerned about the net loss which is shown here on the statement which has been prepared for us for the period April 1, 1980, to February 28, 1981, in which we show a net loss of \$85,000. I would like to ask Mr. Perry, where does the bulk of this net loss come from?

Mr. Perry: That is just the stewards' operations.

Mr. Mancini: What does that mean?

Mr. Perry: Just the bar services, the members' lounge and the press gallery.

Mr. Mancini: I understand that, Mr. Perry, but there are three areas there which you mentioned. I would like to know where the bulk of the \$85,000 comes from of those three areas. Does the bulk of the \$85,000 come from the press gallery or does it come from the members' lounge?

Mr. Perry: I would say it comes equally from the press gallery and the members' lounge.

Mr. Mancini: The members' lounge meaning the room--

Mr. Perry: In the north wing.

Mr. Mancini: --that really nobody uses any more basically?

Mr. Perry: Right.

In the press gallery, as I pointed out in one of my surveys, one of the stewards who is charged against my area primarily does not work for me. He is used to deliver press releases, for the function of a steward serving coffee and liquor and snack services in the press gallery.

Mr. Mancini: I think that is a matter of internal administration that possibly should be taken care of outside this committee. The concerns of this committee should be the quality of service provided to the members, the type of food we receive, what we are being asked to pay for it, and what our general observations are. If one person's salary is being charged against your department, I think that is a matter of internal administration.

First of all, I would like to discuss the point concerning the members' lounge. You may recall--maybe you were not here at the time, Mr. Perry--that there was a time when the members' lounge was used extensively by members and that was prior to 1975, from what I am told. After 1975 I have noticed, from firsthand experience, that the members' lounge was being used excessively, but not by members because members could not go to the members'

lounge, take a group of constituents there or go down with other members and be able to engage in private conversation because there were all kinds of people there, people you had never seen before, sitting around all over the place.

Therefore, over a period of time, members such as myself stopped going into the members' lounge. When I had people here from my constituency I was very reluctant to take them there at that time and I do not find the surroundings all that pleasant to take them there now. That is the first thing about the members' lounge.

Second, I think it is highly unfair that a significant loss in the members' lounge should be included with the food which is being made available to the members in the dining room. In no way do I want to subsidize, through the lunches or dinners that I buy, people who feel they can go into the members' lounge and drink cheaply all day. I think that is highly unfair and I think those areas should be broken down and should be separated.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini, may I interrupt you for one second, and I apologize for doing so. I want to make sure exactly what this financial statement is that we have in front of us. My reproduction of it seems to have something cut off. Is this the operating statement for the entire food and beverage operation for that period?

Mr. Perry: No, there are two.

Mr. Fleming: You may not have received one. There is one that has just been produced, which I think the clerk has, on stewards. There are two of them.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Might I have another explanation of that also? Under stewards' operation, do I understand you to say that includes the members' lounge, the press gallery and the bar in the dining room?

Mr. Perry: That is correct.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: And this \$100,000 item of salary and wages includes all your stewards, excluding what we will call the waitresses in the dining room?

Mr. Perry: Yes. All waitresses come under food services.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Breaking it down, would it also include the catering to individual functions around the building where we often see the same gentlemen who are acting as stewards in the members' lounge? Is that incorporated in it?

Mr. Perry: That is incorporated in it as well.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: So this statement, showing a loss of \$85,000, could be attributed to many features and functions that are ongoing in this building because the cost accounting for our purposes at this time is not elaborate enough. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. Perry: Not really. If you really want to break it down, it is the two main areas where, shall we say, sales for the labour expended, are the press gallery and the members' lounge. I have a full time steward in the members' lounge and two full time stewards in the press gallery.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I just want to break this down so it is more understandable. The same steward who finished, say, eight hours of work at a particular wage scale might then come up here and serve overtime at one of the extra functions and it then gets labelled in here.

That would distort the profit and loss picture here, because I might say that not only is he costing us money down there but he is costing us twice the amount of money to come up and serve at a private function that you may not cost account accurately to that ministry or the person using those services later on.

Mr. Perry: That may have been true in the past but now, if it is an outside function or an after-hours function, I charge the labour to that function.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: So the total package is there?

Mr. Perry: Yes.

Mr. Fleming: We could give you a complete breakdown according to departments.

4 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, just to answer the question on the use of the members' lounge, this is a matter which I personally think the committee could look at, because I think the real problem lies in the necessity of some type of decision being made, possibly by the House leaders and, in fact, by the caucuses in general, as to the use of that lounge.

I know that in the past, when it has been suggested that the lounge should be limited to members, as Mr. Mancini indicated it was in the past, there has been a feeling, certainly on the part of one caucus at least, that it would not be acceptable, that staff should be permitted in that lounge. I really feel that if that question could be resolved at some point, then it would certainly make it easier for us to determine what kind of service to put in the lounge.

Mr. Mancini: While the discussion concerning the lounge is very interesting and I know there has been a lot of discussion about it before, you are not going to get members using that lounge unless we can be given at least some privacy. Because if Mr. Wrye or Mr. Boudria, Mr. O'Neil and I want to go down and have a quiet chat it is impossible in that situation.

However, I want to move on to the restaurant which is really my main concern. I would like to ask Mr. Perry: do the restaurant expenses include rent for the premises?

Mr. Perry: No.

Mr. Mancini: Does it include furniture?

Mr. Perry: Renewals, but not the existing furniture. If I buy a replacement chair or I have them recovered, yes, they are charged.

Mr. Mancini: Do you have to pay public utilities?

Mr. Perry: No.

Mr. Mancini: No lighting, none of that?

Mr. Perry: No, none at all.

Mr. Mancini: So your only expense then in the restaurant is labour and food?

Mr. Perry: And equipment--crockery, glasses.

Mr. Mancini: Is that supplied to you by the Legislature?

Mr. Perry: No, it is not, it is charged against my--

Mr. Mancini: So, unlike normal businesses, which would have to pay either rent or mortgages upon a building, you are free from those encumbrances and also the utilities, and you have existing furniture that you did not have to go out and purchase and pay for and therefore charge to the cost of the food?

Mr. Perry: Right.

Mr. Mancini: That being the case then, it is my humble opinion that at the prices you charge in that restaurant and the quality of food you serve, it should be impossible to run a deficit in that restaurant. I say that with all respect.

There is no way that a person who operates a restaurant and has to pay only for the food, for the staff and maybe to replace a glass if it is broken, and charges \$2.25 for a corned beef sandwich, can say that restaurant cannot make money and that it cannot pay its own way.

That is what offends me the most, Mr. Perry, because the public have a perception, maybe because of what goes on in Ottawa and maybe not, but they think that we are eating great food down here for almost nothing. And the real truth is that the members are paying their way in that dining room. I defy you to spend a couple of hours with me and travel the city of Toronto, and we can go into different restaurants where you can get a corned beef sandwich, where I know those people are paying rent or paying mortgages, and paying public utilities and have to buy their own equipment, and you can get a similar corned beef sandwich for \$2.25 or maybe less.

That, I think, is the problem that the members of the committee are going to have to address and try to resolve. We are

being told, and I am tired of hearing it, that the services provided around here for members are being provided at a deficit. First of all, let us look at the reality of it. The members, through their lack of use of that lounge, are telling all of us that they do not really appreciate it. Secondly, in the prices we are paying for the food in the restaurant, we are paying our way.

Frankly, I do not like the type of accounting which is going on, because it appears as though we are extracting a free lunch from the taxpayers and that is just not true. I could go on about several other possibly minute points about the restaurant. I will not mention them all except one other and that is, the hours of business.

I come in from out of town and I get in here on Monday and I may get in at 10:30. I walk into my office, I maybe feel like an early lunch or a late breakfast and I cannot go into the members' dining room and obtain that. I work here until six o'clock at night on Monday night, I want to work until eight o'clock or so. There is no place in these parliament buildings where I can get a bite to eat; I always have to leave the buildings. Wednesday is the same.

Frankly, I am a little disappointed. I was one of the members who, three or four years ago, thought it highly appropriate to rid ourselves of the caterer who was here, and to have the lounge and all the facilities put under the auspices of the Speaker. But, you are operating under the same hours, you are serving us the same food, for the same prices, as that gentleman did. And we are doing all of this at a considerable deficit.

I don't want to be too critical, but it does cause me some concern when our constituents think--and I am sure we have all heard it going around the ridings, possibly talking to people--and it just kind of blurts out, that we are having great meals down there for free. And when the press picks up a statement like this, \$85,000 deficit for the operation of the members' dining room and restaurant. They are not going to go into all of the details we are going into now to find out the problems and where the difficulties lie. We are just going to be tagged as a bunch of freeloaders, and eating off the taxpayers and obtaining a free lunch.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini, I would point out to you just for the record, that you are looking at the wrong statement. In fact it is not \$85,000; \$85,000 deficit appears to be for the operation of the steward service only. There is an additional \$200,000 on the food services.

Mr. Mancini: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your pointing that out because that accentuates my concern; it just makes it even worse.

So, I don't want to be highly critical of you, Mr. Perry, because I know you were hired to do a specific job, and I know there are restrictions under which you operate. And I think it is highly incumbent upon the members' services committee to assist a person like Mr. Perry, who has the knowledge and the background

and the capability to operate a proper restaurant.

But from the way things are going now, it is highly embarrassing to me as a member. I am really not too thrilled, to tell you the truth, to have a group of constituents in and bring them down into the lounge, or into the dining room, when a person cannot even get a hot beef sandwich or something of that nature. I just do not understand what the problem is. Anyway, those are my comments. I'm sorry I went too long, but it has been bugging me for a long time.

Mr. Perry: First of all, the members' lounge. Recommendations were put forward that we improve the food service there, which means improving the kitchen facilities, and redecorate the lounge, and then the members can decide who is going to use it. At the moment, staff can use it, administration staff can use it, anybody dropping into the building can use it, and I do not feel it is my stewards' position to deny access to that room to anybody. That has to be a decision made by the members.

As far as the dining room is concerned, my largest expense is labour. You are quite correct. When an outside caterer was doing this catering service, the wages were approximately \$3 to \$3.50 an hour for waitresses; busboys were being paid the same. When the government took over, the rates increased by 40 per cent immediately. Since then, they have gone up considerably more.

Mr. Mancini: What is the average wage?

Mr. Perry: About \$6 an hour. A lot of my friends are in the restaurant business and they are paying nowhere near that sort of salary for a waitress or a waiter.

Mr. Rotenberg: So why are we?

Mr. Perry: Because they come under government regulations.

Mr. Mancini: That still would not make up the total difference for that deficit.

Mr. Perry: On top of that, you have four outlets here. For a building this size, and for the business generated, in my opinion, it is ludicrous to have a cafeteria, a members' lounge, a press gallery, and a dining room, all open at 8:30 in the morning for coffee services and breakfast.

Mr. Mancini: You see, Mr. Perry, you are missing the point. Either you provide these services to members in a way in which we can use them, or do not bother providing them. If I come in from Windsor--

Mr. G. W. Taylor: That's our decision, Remo.

Mr. Perry: Yes, I cannot make that decision--

Mr. Chairman: I think that Mr. Perry, whatever our criticisms may be, is simply the one who carries out whatever mandate is provided to him, either by us or generally.

Mr. Mancini: I was just responding to his point that we don't need four outlets.

Mr. Chairman: He is making the point to committee that we don't.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Quite accurate.

Mr. Watson: (Inaudible) committee, and I was here and recommended they close it, and we turned it down.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mancini has covered most of what I wanted to cover and I find that, unusually, I am in agreement with most of what Mr. Mancini said.

4:10 p.m.

Really the question we should probably be asking Mr. Perry is how come, on roughly \$350,000 of gross sales, we have a \$200,000 loss on the dining room, snack bar and catering service. I think one of the reasons is that we have a much higher payroll. Maybe we can find out from you or Mr. Fleming how much that extra payroll reflects.

Secondly, we are providing a lot of empty space, space that is not being used. When we get into the liquor sales I think it even gets worse, although it is a 100 per cent subsidy. Apparently, from what Mr. Perry says, we are charging some things up for stewards who are sitting there all day doing things other than actually selling liquor.

It seems to me, as Mr. Mancini has said, that not having to pay rent and utilities probably could somewhat overcome the extra amount that we have to pay in payroll. We should be much more competitive with other restaurants, seeing that the prices on food are not that much lower than in restaurants in the downtown area. On liquor, the prices are very much lower, and as much as I am a little upset about the subsidy on the food, I am even much more upset over the subsidy the taxpayers are paying on liquor.

It is not so much the subsidy we are paying for our own members because, yes, I agree, certain service should be given to members. But we are paying the subsidies to anybody who walks in off the street to order a drink or have lunch.

Perhaps we can get some better cost breakdowns of exactly where these losses are, where the money is going and exactly how the excess in the dollar per hour in payroll reflects to the losses on our statements and, more important, the excess in payroll for things which really do not relate to food and beverage services.

Unless someone can demonstrate to me very much otherwise, I think one of the choices we have is to restrict these subsidized

services to members and their guests only. I am wondering, for instance--I know this is a no-no for any politician to say so--why we should be subsidizing the press gallery to the tune that we are subsidizing it. Why should there be services to members of the press?

If the working press, as any other working group, wishes to have some sort of facilities, then it is up to them or their employers to provide those facilities. We provide free accommodation for them, but why we should be providing a bar at 50 per cent of regular cost and a messenger service to those people too, and to anyone else who walks into the press gallery, I don't know. Why we should be providing a restaurant at a lower price to anybody who wants to walk in off the street and sit in that restaurant which is subsidized by taxpayers, I don't know, Mr. Chairman.

These are questions I don't think we are going to be able to solve or answer today. This is a system that has grown up. As Mr. Watson said, when the previous members service committee was constituted, it made certain policy decisions which are not the fault of Mr. Perry or Mr. Fleming, but certainly show up in these statements.

I think it is incumbent upon us to go back, really, to first principles of the food and beverage service in this building and consider whether it should be cost accounted or subsidized and who should get the benefit of subsidization; should just food be subsidized, or should food and liquor be subsidized; and what locations, if any, should come under the jurisdiction of the Speaker, through Mr. Fleming and Mr. Perry. Where should we have these services, and yes, what hours should the services be on. These are some basic policy decisions we have to make, and I would like some further information and more breakdowns before I am prepared to make those decisions.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I can make roughly the same comments as the other individuals. I have had my stay in the restaurant downstairs, but I, too, with an eye for a dollar and a penny, have watched the other different areas throughout the building. If I happened to be you, sir, trying to operate these, I would be pulling my hair out, what little there is left of it.

How do you operate when you see that salaries and wages are 121 per cent of sales for the stewards and 83 per cent of sales for the food part, knowing that you have duplication of bodies in the four centres that are serving booze, and not serving enough booze as it is, thus highly subsidizing it? It is the same with food. You have servers of food in the press gallery, in the members' lounge, in the cafeteria part and in the dining room, and still trying to run a business.

You cannot run any type of restaurant that way. I am sure the comment is made, "What quality of food is this at the prices we are paying," when most of it is because we are not running a very efficient operation to begin with, spread, as it is, throughout the building.

When I look around the members' lounge, as it is called, the members' dining room, the press gallery, I see that members are in the minority, I would suspect, the greatest percentage of the time those operations are open. So, we are, in effect, subsidizing more than just members. The media would sometimes lead us to believe that it is only the members who are being subsidized when they themselves are being subsidized also. Just as it does Mr. Rotenberg, it certainly offends me to be subsidizing the booze part of the operation for all and sundry.

It is incumbent upon us to improve it. I did some sampling with different members today and found that they were not too pleased with the hours, they would like to see some hamburgers and more salads--one even wanted peanut butter sandwiches--

Mr. Rotenberg: With jelly?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Without jelly.

Others would like to see charge facilities. It is up to us to change to a more efficient operation, or at least to give Mr. Perry some instruction on how to run the operation more efficiently. I am sure, Mr. Perry, your restaurant friends would be appalled at how we run the system around here. It certainly should receive criticism, but you should not, sir, because you are working under our instructions.

I would like the committee to give some firm recommendations to the staff and to the administration for changes, to see if it can be improved.

I do have one question which concerns the item, "internal inventory transfer from dining room." Is that food transfer under stewards?

Mr. Perry: Yes, it is food that we produce in the kitchen and transfer to the stewards' area.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: There was one other item, "costs of goods available for sale," under "members' dining room." Is that just straight food?

Mr. Perry: That is correct.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: "Purchases for the stewards' operation" is another item. Under "cost of goods sold," you have "purchases, \$47,000." What is included in the term "purchases"?

Mr. Perry: Just all the liquor, beer and wine purchased for the building.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Okay. Where does it show what you referred to as crockery, glasses and things like that?

Mr. Perry: If you look on the front page, "dining room services," you will find it under "miscellaneous general expenses" and "the depreciation of equipment."

Mr. G. W. Taylor: What would supplies of \$15,000 be?

Mr. Perry: Paper goods and cleaning materials for the dishwashing machine.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I saw an item, "revenue from sales: liquor, beer, tobacco, sundry, miscellaneous." That is on your note to "stewards' operation." So that, when you look at the subsidization of \$85,000, does that include liquor, beer, tobacco, sundry and miscellaneous that we are subsidizing?

Mr. Perry: Yes. The miscellaneous items could be anything like pop or just a few odds and ends.

One of the problems is my pricing structure. If a member wishes to purchase a bottle of liquor, I buy it from the liquor board, and I charge \$1 to send it up to the member; that is a handling charge. If I buy a case of beer, I charge \$2 for purchasing it, storing it and then taking it upstairs for delivery.

Obviously, at these prices, if I am paying the steward \$7 an hour to act as a delivery man, there is not sufficient profit in \$1 on a bottle of liquor to justify it.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Is there much of that taking place in the building, that the members would buy a bottle of liquor to be delivered?

Mr. Perry: Quite a few. There are also the host bars. If it were a hotel, I would charging about \$32 a bottle for rum, rye or gin. Here all I do is to charge about \$13 a bottle.

Mr. McLean: Some guy could deliver 10 bottles in an hour and, therefore, make \$3 on top of what your costs are. Hell, you cannot lose money on it.

Mr. Wrye: I have a couple of questions which might aid this committee in reaching some determination as to whether it can really cut into the deficit.

Starting first with the stewards' operation: You break your revenue down into four categories, but when we get to payroll, salaries, wages and benefits are just lumped together. Would you be in a position where you might be able to provide the committee with a breakdown--dining room, members' lounge, et cetera--into four categories in terms of the cost of wages, since wages is the largest single item?

Mr. Perry: Certainly.

Mr. Wrye: I suggest that would be very useful for this committee, in that you seem to be suggesting that at least one of the three components we now have, the dining room, members' lounge and press gallery--and I would guess the members' lounge--might be a little redundant for what we need. Could you provide a breakdown to the committee on that area?

Mr. Perry: Certainly. In point of fact, at the last meeting, which was in November, I gave a breakdown of the press gallery with a recommendation that this cost be reviewed. The press gallery, at that time, at those wages cost \$43,000 to operate in labour--that is for two stewards, plus the overtime, plus benefits--primarily as a service to the press, as far as I am aware.

Mr. Wrye: You indicated earlier, though, that at least one of those stewards was, in effect, not working as a steward, but was working as a delivery man for press releases, ministerial statements and what have you. Is it your feeling that he has very little press function? I have only been in the press gallery recently on a couple of occasions, but there has never been more than one steward there.

Mr. Perry: Because the other one is always delivering around the building.

Mr. Wrye: Could I ask administration why that is chargeable to the gallery and not charged up in some other way? It does really throw this--

Mr. Fleming: This particular individual is distributing ministry statements, reports from agencies and commissions--things of either a government or a Legislative Assembly nature--and therefore it probably would not be proper to charge that to the media. However, as far as that individual's salary is concerned, for fiscal year 1981-82, it is being allocated to general administration rather than to the press gallery as such.

Mr. Wrye: So we will have a significant reduction in that area?

Mr. Fleming: Well, yes, to the extent of the salary of that individual, which is \$15,200.

Mr. Wrye: I have another area I would like to pursue. I might say that while I certainly share the concerns of the committee, on first glance we are certainly not being heavily subsidized, given the prices we pay both for food and for bar service. While the prices are competitive, I do not find them unreasonably low. They are certainly in no way comparable to the very low prices paid by members, staff and others in Ottawa.

So I think we should be searching for some other reasons and some other possible savings. I suggest to you that that is one, because properly it should not be charged up in the way it has been.

In terms of the dining room, I might ask you if you have done a month-by-month breakdown of the revenue you have been able to derive from dining room service as opposed to cost. I have the sense you do very well when the House is sitting and take a real beating when the House is not. My concern is that there is almost no way to solve that problem.

Mr. Perry: That is correct, unless there is a committee. If there are many committees on, then on those days I obviously can justify having the staff here.

Mr. Wrye: What about during the summer months?

Mr. Perry: The last two years we have been very busy during the summer as well; not quite as busy as when the House is in session, of course, but we have still been quite busy.

Mr. Wrye: Is there any area of saving that you can see, because we do have a deficit of \$200,000 over 11 months in the food service area? Are there any areas of saving in terms of cutting back that you could see?

Mr. Perry: It is the erratic nature of the services. I have eight waitresses. Some days I have 140 people in for lunch. The next day I could have 220 in for lunch, plus three lunches around the building. I never know when I am going to have them. They are booked the day before, that is true, but I never know exactly how many people are going to come in for lunch because members could be out.

It particularly applies at dinner in the evenings. I have had occasion when we have put on a special dinner and I have had 30 members turn up. I suddenly find out afterwards that they have all been invited out to the chiropractors' dinner or something else and nobody informed me..

Mr. Wrye: In closing, may I just make one other statement. I would echo the comments of Mr. Mancini and others that those of us who come from regions other than Metropolitan Toronto and its immediate environs find it very unacceptable on Monday and Wednesday nights, when on most occasions we do have business to carry out in our offices, that we are forced to leave the building to get dinner. I would urge this committee and I would urge you, Mr. Perry, to take a look at having at least some brief service in the dining room on those two evenings.

On Mondays the House does not rise until six. On Wednesdays I would venture a guess that with the committees now working, a lot of them are here, while those who are not working on committees are spending the day getting done a lot of the paperwork on which they have fallen behind on Mondays and Tuesdays. They would probably be more than willing to use the dining room at six o'clock and might provide a little more consistency than some of the other inconsistent times you have. You would only need two or three waitresses and a small group. In terms of it being a members' service, it would be very useful to many of us.

Mr. Samis: I wonder if I might go ahead of Mr. Boudria, I have to pop down to the House. I will be very brief.

First of all, I am attracted to Mr. Rotenberg's suggestion, beginning with some comments on zero-base budgeting, but maybe we should just start at zero altogether in terms of services, costs,

sales, expenses, you name it, and beginning from there. Since we are starting a new mandate with this Parliament, I think it might not be a bad idea to start on that basis.

Secondly, I would like to make a general point. A couple of members have already alluded to what goes on in Ottawa. Some of us are rather unfamiliar beyond what we read in the press as to what goes on in Ottawa in terms of services, costs, expenses, their financial situation and what problems they have to cope with compared to what you have to cope with. There is one member here who may be very enlightening and I am glad he is on this committee.

I wonder if the committee would give consideration to contacting whoever it is responsible in the federal Parliament to provide us with information on their financial arrangements, their food arrangements, their service arrangements, and every legislature in the country, especially the province of Quebec because I think some of their services put us to shame in this building and in this Legislature.

I think it would be beneficial if we compare services, arrangements and some of the financial problems they have with what these gentlemen have. I would ask, not immediately, that the clerk or somebody on staff here could begin the process of making contact with the other legislatures and parliaments to find out how we compare with them in a variety of areas.

Mr. Boudria: My previous position prior to being here was the chief purchasing agent for the parliamentary restaurant in Ottawa, so most of the information you would seek from there I probably have a great deal of it just from memory.

I do not think the example there is particularly what we want. I know it is, and I quote from the magazine, Epicure, "the finest restaurant in this country," but for a \$4.3 million deficit it has every reason to be. I do not particularly think that this is what we want here. Fine, they have beautiful service and everything; that is true. Meals sell for \$2 and all this type of thing.

Mr. Fleming: We appreciate that you said that.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: It is a wellknown fact and an accepted fact there. If it were not, the members of the House of Commons have every opportunity to change it, just as we have here. They are in charge of it and it is their operation, but it is what they expect and I guess it is what they get.

Without trying to match that kind of thing, there are two things I am trying to achieve here. First of all, if we have messengers who are charged to the restaurant operation, obviously for accounting purposes that should be separated. Also, if two or three members like to have a nice little bar some place but the rest of us are subsidizing that, that should be separated as well.

I think if you eliminate all of those things the deficit of the restaurant does not look all that bad. Maybe if it does not look all that bad we could afford to have it open a few extra

hours so that those of us who come from out of town could eat, because the purpose of a restaurant is to eat, not to subsidize drinks for somebody who wants a drink.

Those of us who come from out of town, in my case 275 miles, do not go home for dinner. When we come here on Monday morning, we come here to work, and that is the only reason we are here. When we go back home on Friday, we do all of those other things on the weekend. While we are here we like to at least have some facility where we can have something at night.

If it is deemed through some statistics that we have, that it is not feasible to even open the restaurant at night, maybe it is better to open a little snack bar where, on those two nights that the House is not sitting, we can at least have something to eat. Instead of having a bar that is not even used open, we can have a restaurant that will fulfil a legitimate need, which is eating which is far more important than drinking.

Mr. O'Neil: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I was one of the members who came here in 1975 and I was not too impressed with the dining room, the people they had running it and in some cases some of the staff they had. I feel a certain amount of congratulations is due to Mr. Perry for some of the ways in which he has changed around that dining room through the management of it.

The two girls you have there as sort of submanagers and some of the staff do an excellent job and are very obliging whenever the members, myself included, ask for something, whether it is outside of the dining room or when we go down there and ask for reservations. With their personalities and the way they look after us, I think you are to be congratulated for having that type of help.

I know there are certain complaints about the menu and I have them from time to time. Somebody mentioned wanting a hamburger. I often want just a little thing like a hot sandwich at noon hour, off the roast of beef or pork or something like that. You might give a little variation to that side of the menu.

I wonder if we could suggest, as a committee, that between yourself and Mr. Fleming you zero in on some of these problems we have, one of them pertaining to the members' lounge in the north wing and one of them to the press gallery--we know now what they are costing because they are left open--and make direct suggestions, if they were cut out, as to how much would be saved that could be used in some other way, whether it might be to keep the dining room open or the snack bar open on other dates, and other cost-saving ideas you might have.

As I say, it could pertain to the members' lounge in the north wing; it could pertain to the press gallery; it could pertain maybe to some other ideas or suggestions that you had maybe previously submitted to this committee. I would be interested in looking at them and then it would be up to the committee to see what they do.

Mr. Perry: Sure.

Mr. Fleming: We made a fairly major submission to the Board of Internal Economy last fall concerning the whole question of prices and services. The only recommendation they approved was that there would be an overall food cost increase of 20 per cent, but they felt very definitely that the services should not be reduced. I think that is the sort of position we are in at this point. We could certainly give you the papers that we have produced for the Board of Internal Economy which would be helpful and which, I think, would explain the questions you are asking.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, I would like a copy of that as I am sure the rest of the members would because we may have to make a decision on that which will help to improve the cost picture and also maybe the service in other areas.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Along the same line as Mr. O'Neil, there have been some members who long for those good old days when, I believe, this room and the adjoining room happened to be the members' dining room, and thus a little light came into their lives. It was a more exclusive dining room at the time.

Do the facilities still lend themselves to that, doing away with what is down there? Or because of the configuration of the building, the construction et cetera, it is not a possibility or even a financially successful one to operate on a very exclusive scale for members and their guests only?

Mr. Fleming: Maybe I could answer that. Taking over the dining room from the Ministry of Government Services, it was conditional as far as the Premier was concerned that members of the public would be admitted. I think he and other people associated with him felt that they would not want to see the Speaker and the assembly having the dining room unless there was going to be that public access.

As far as the decor is concerned, we have attempted to change it fairly recently. There, again, you get into a good deal of cost, even taking fabrics off walls and putting up small paintings and that kind of thing. We have felt that the change was needed, so there was an alteration made in the decor in the dining room and the snack bar very recently.

Looking at the positive side of this thing, Mr. Perry feels very definitely that if we could expand the whole area which is taken up by the kitchen, the dining room and the cafeteria, the ministers' dining room, possibly westward in the basement, that that would help greatly. Part of our problem is that we simply lack the space in the kitchen to be able to do what we want to do, and we lack the space in the dining room also to accommodate people at times.

Mr. O'Neil: What area west of the dining room?

Mr. Fleming: Excuse me, I mean east of the dining room. That area which is occupied by the barber and some of the attendants and the nurse and that kind of thing. It is a little like trying to run a galley on a ship at the moment; it is very very confining. As much as Mr. Perry would like to do special

orders for some members, as he pointed out to me today, if you go into the kitchen when the place is an absolute hive of activity, trying to look after what is on the menu, it is extremely difficult to suddenly give somebody a special sandwich. It is not for lack of wanting to do it.

Mr. O'Neil: Have you had any costing or estimates on what it would cost to do that?

Mr. Fleming: No, we have not. We have a firm of catering and food consultants that we have been speaking with. They have helped us find some more space in the back underneath the entrance way to the building for storage. It has been suggested that we should take over the area which is presently the Ministry of Government Services' boardroom, which is sort of a staff boardroom for Government Services employees in the building. That is just to the west of the cafeteria, and behind there.

That definitely would give us more space for the cafeteria. We have, in fact, in the last year expanded the cafeteria somewhat and have some more seating there.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, that might be something that we could consider as to whether we might give the go-ahead to Mr. Fleming, for enlarging those premises there so that we would have a suitable kitchen and more space. That is a suggestion anyway.

Mr. Fleming: I think it is something that this committee might look at.

Mr. Hodgson: If I could reply to Mr. Taylor's remark about the good old days when we had the dining room here and in that room there. Members couldn't even get in here. You had to line up and wait for your meal. Now the service where we are located at present is much superior to what it was in the good old days.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I am only repeating statements. I do not know and I do not wish for what happen to be labelled "the good old days," Mr. Hodgson, but I have heard that said by different members.

A further comment. There is \$107,000 in the snack bar; is that what you refer to as the cafeteria?

Mr. Perry: Yes.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: It does nearly as much as the dining room, it would appear. Are you using the same production facilities? I see steam trays with a standardized meal.

Mr. Perry: The only production facility is the one kitchen. In the cafeteria, we have a french fryer and a grill top for doing eggs and bacon; but all my cooking facilities are in the kitchen, and from there we also produce the catering services which, as you can see, are \$84,000.

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder if I may make a comment; if I may be excused, I have to leave very shortly.

I shall be in trouble if I don't mention this, and I don't know whether you want to mention anything other than food services, Mr. Fleming. Mr. Newman asked me if I would bring up the point concerning--

As you likely know, Mr. Newman lost his wife just a short while ago; and one of the things he has asked me to mention to you is that, in such a case, where there are certain events in Toronto, like the opening of the Legislature, whether or not the government might consider that someone in his immediate family, say his daughter, be allowed to accompany him to an opening or some such event, and be covered under "costs," just as his wife would be?

I would ask if that is being considered, or whether you would take it under advisement.

Mr. Fleming: It has been discussed by the Board of Internal Economy on one occasion some months ago. They did not reach any conclusion about it. It raised certain questions in general, other than Mr. Newman's specific case, and I have assured Mr. Newman that I would propose that it be put back on the agenda for discussion by the board as soon as possible.

Mr. O'Neil: Thank you. May I be excused?

Mr. Chairman: By all means.

I wonder if I might offer a few comments on the situation at this time, as a member more than as the chairman.

I have an inherent sensitivity, I suppose, to not objecting to taking heat or criticism for something that is legitimately mine. If indeed I felt that we, as members of this Legislature, were somehow receiving service that entitled us to receive \$285,000 worth of deficit heat, I suppose that is a decision that we, as members, should actively make.

I can say to you, though, that looking down the various divisions and the various outlets are on the list, and looking at those things that are actually provided to us as members, it is obvious that we are really not getting full value for our deficit heat dollar, if I can put it that way.

By and large, we as members receive little benefit from the food or liquor service in the press gallery. Yes, it goes without saying that we have a standing invitation to use those facilities, but by and large they are not facilities that are there in the first instance for the members. Yet, whatever portion of the deficit accrues as a result of the press gallery operation, we are still responsible for it.

The north wing lounge; again, I have never used it. But perhaps others have; I have not been here that long. I have looked

at it, and frankly I do not find it appealing to me personally, and certainly it is not somewhere that I have an interest in taking guests; so I do not particularly want to be responsible for taking heat for whatever deficit that incurs either.

To a point, I think it is fair to say that what we refer to as either the snack bar or the cafeteria is a facility that is here primarily for the use of people other than the members. That is probably the only general staff or general public in-and-out type of eating facility that this building has to offer. I do not think that anybody around here would suggest that, in the first instance, it is there to serve the members. Mr. Boudria has pointed out, both last week and this week, that it is not even open at a time when he and other out of town members, of which I am not one, would be in a position to use it. So I have some reluctance to take the heat for the deficit that place incurs as well.

What it finally comes down to is that, although there are a number of events that are catered around here which I, as a member, or other members, might participate in, but not likely to in the first instance or we would be paying directly, or have some involvement with, we come back truly to the members' dining room. From my standpoint and my outlook on it, that is a place where I would like to be able to go to enjoy a decent meal in the congeniality and conviviality of other members of the Legislature from all parties. It is very definitely a place where I would like to take visitors to my office, either from my riding or from within my own organization and associations, and treat them to a first class meal.

I am not suggesting, from my personal standpoint, that I want the service there to compete with the triple-A restaurants, of which there are many in Metropolitan Toronto. But I would like to feel that it is some place where they can go and yes, indeed, it is a treat for them to eat there and it has been a pleasure and it is part of the prestige of these buildings and this Legislature; of that calibre. It simply is not the situation now.

As I said, I offer these comments as an individual member and not specifically as the chairman, but, as we look ahead to how we may come to grips with these many things, I have been rather taking note of all the individual comments and suggestions that members of committee have made at this time. One that was not mentioned and I will toss in, one that Mr. Perry and Mr. Fleming have heard before, is the situation relating to salad bars and luncheon buffets and other utilization and other things that might be available or might serve to produce more revenue.

In the first instance I would like to throw into the hopper here two more things that might happen. First of all, if, for some reason, we are going to continue with the service exactly as it is now, there should be a more accurate and more specific accounting system that actually tracks what the members' deficit is, relative to the services specifically available to them.

Is it not interesting that we would be damned in the press as members for a \$285,000 deficit? I can name probably a half

dozen columnists who would take great delight in pointing to those fellows at Queen's Park--not so much in Metro perhaps but out and about--and say: "Look at what these fellows are doing. On liquor alone they are costing you, the people of Ontario, \$85,000 in subsidy during that period." I would bet you dollars to doughnuts that there would not be a single mention in there of how much of that deficit occurs in the press gallery.

What I am suggesting is that we have an accounting system to which we, as members, may be realistically accountable, and not accountable for things that other outside facilities, particularly the press gallery, may run up.

If I could summarize not so much my feelings but the feelings of the committee and I think I am certainly in the mainstream with them, it seems at this point that the appropriate way to proceed from here, and I certainly would add my compliments to Mr. Perry and Mr. Fleming for the job they have been doing under, I think, very handcuffed conditions that have been imposed upon them over the past couple of years.

These include the staffing--I have already mentioned that to them privately in some discussions we had before this meeting; that the staffing thing absolutely leaves me in a cold sweat when in the food industry generally, if anybody has had any experience with the hospitality industry, food service is always one of those absolutely minimum wage jobs. I think there are special provisions within the Labour Relations Act which say--

Mr. Samis: You are not bragging about that, I hope.

Mr. Chairman: No, not at all. I am drawing this comparison, in fact, because they are generally paid the minimum wage or less in anticipation of gratuities that they may receive. We seem somehow to have the converse situation to that. By way again of a personal comment, I would say that for the maximum wage we are receiving the minimum personal service from the waitresses and the servers within your dining room at this point.

Beyond that it seems to be the consensus of committee that, having given you the benefit of all of our individual comments--Mr. Taylor, I know, and others have checked with the various members of their caucuses and have come back here to offer all these suggestions to you or a possible way to go--it seems to be the consensus of the committee, and I will certainly stand to be corrected, that we put it back to you for you to come back to us as a committee in the light of the changes--and I do not mean to be partisan--that March 19 brought about, both in composition of the committee and the composition of the Board of Internal Economy perhaps. That we do try to produce a service, a genuine members' service, that both serves the needs and specific desires of the people that it is designed for. Perhaps you would like to suggest to me some sort of time frame for that so we can take a look at what you have to do, or, on the other hand, would like to offer comment on what I have just said.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks. What I would like to see is for them to come back with a detailed report on the staffing in the members' lounge, the cost of the staffing, what profit was made there; the same with the press lounge, how many staff members are there, the cost of that staff and the profit there; and the same in the cafeteria and the snack bar.

I think that we need to have more information. We need to have a look at the facilities that are there. From my point of view I see the lounge could probably be placed in another area closer to the cafeteria, in a smaller area, where you would be utilizing the one bar, the one cafeteria. I would like to see a detailed report on that and then perhaps the committee could take a look at what facilities are there.

Mr. Fleming: The only comment I would have is that I think it would be appreciated if the committee could look into the question as to what your recommendations might be on the use of the members' lounge, because it is almost impossible for us to make recommendations in that respect.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Fleming, in regard to that, can you come back with detailed information to us as to what the clientele is there, what the revenues are specifically, what the expenditures are?

You ask for our recommendations and as politicians I am certain that we are not the least bit shy to make a recommendation if you can come back with a bit more detailed information on that operation, perhaps on each individual operation because that is what we are looking at. I suggest to you we will have no difficulty making a recommendation to you based on that.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, okay.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on the items?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: In talking square footage you mentioned going westerly towards the barbershop.

Mr. Fleming: I am sorry, I meant east.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: East, towards the barbershop. I do not know about everyone else, but I start thinking that you have the cabinet dining room, so-called, but then you have also a lot of square footage in the hallway between the pillars and the dining room.

What would your capacity be if you were to absorb that kind of space? Does that make it a better operation for you to consider that you might even, as has been suggested from time to time, put in individual rooms? Because there are different stages as we go along where somebody might say, "I would like to bring down X number of people to have a particular meeting at noon hour in a private room."

Does it lend itself to that, or do you have any little drawings where you have projected the thoughts you may have had

for the future extension that way, taking in some of those considerations?

Mr. Fleming: There was a proposal made by the food service consultants that we should extend the dining room right out to in front of the CNIB kiosk and incorporate that, and also probably do away with the cloakroom area at the west side as you go into the dining room, then use the present foyer area for tables and then maybe move down east.

Of course, the problem we would get into is one we have had discussions with people in the Premier's office about and there is the whole matter of a special entrance to the cabinet and Premier's dining room and the question of how they could receive people coming in through their private entrance.

Like all things around here, it would be a matter of extreme negotiation, I would think. So far we have not got to first base in our discussions with the Ministry of Government Services on making extensions of that sort.

Mr. Perry: What I would personally like to see, having been down there two years, is the whole south side of the corridor, which is the barbershop, the clerks' area--they have an area down there--the nurses' area and the area that is used by the pages; I would like to have a look at the whole area and see whether we should be relocating down there a lounge which could be a members' lounge, a press lounge, split or combined with a bar in the middle, a snack area where we could have primarily soups and salads.

Perhaps we could relocate the minister's lounge and look at the whole of that area. At the moment, as Mr. Fleming has pointed out, who owns what part of that area and who will give it up and where do you relocate them? I would like to look at that whole area. There is a lot of wasted space, to my way of thinking.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further comments by the committee? Shall we ask Mr. Fleming and Mr. Perry to go back and prepare further detailed and specific reports and return them here? That is agreed to. How long would you think that might take?

Mr. Fleming: It is simply a case of getting the added manpower to get the facts together. What would you think, Mr. Perry?

Mr. Perry: It shouldn't take more than a couple of weeks actually.

Mr. Fleming: I would say about two to three weeks' time.

Mr. Chairman: We will reschedule it for two weeks from today. If there is any change or any delay beyond that, if you will let me know I will bring it to the members' attention.

Mr. Hodgson: Whom do you have to get the authority from to plan what has been suggested here?

Mr. Fleming: The first thing is that this committee would have to make a specific proposal to the House, according to your terms of reference. This would then be turned over to the Board of Internal Economy. The Board of Internal Economy would then examine it, and it would be up to the discretion of the Board of Internal Economy as to whether it would go ahead or not.

Mr. Hodgson: Then the Ministry of Government Services would have to do the paying.

Mr. Fleming: No, the assembly would pay, but we are dealing with certain areas that are not ours. One of them is under the jurisdiction of the Premier's office and Government Services, namely, the ministers' dining room.

Mr. Chairman: I have two other pieces of business that can be brought before committee today for your consideration. They both came in somewhat late and did not make the agenda.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I had something I wanted to discuss as well, but I didn't discuss it with you previously.

Mr. Chairman: All right, perhaps if I can do these, and then we'll do yours.

Mr. Boudria: That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that I would have the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: By all means. One is a memorandum from Mr. Miggiani which deals with requests for estimates for the 1981-82 fiscal year. If it is your wish, you can just leave it with the chair and I will bring something back to you along with Mr. Richardson as to what that may be in due course. Does anybody have any other problem with that?

The second and probably much more sensitive one, which I will have the clerk distribute now, is a letter from Mr. Swart of Welland-Thorold. It is regarding, as you will see, raising once again the matter of installing audio speakers in each of the member's individual offices so that they may monitor the course of debate within the House. Is it your wish that we try to deal with this today or perhaps we can send Mr. Fleming off? I am informed that Mr. Fleming indeed can speak to this. Do you want to speak to it today, Mr. Fleming, or would you like it deferred? Is it the wish of the committee that Mr. Fleming speak to the item?

Mr. Fleming: I have discussed Mr. Swart's letter with the chief of Hansard, Peter Brannan, and he tells me that at present there are approximately 60 loudspeaker units in the building. These are, at the moment, installed in the leaders' offices, the house leaders' offices, the whips' offices, the offices of cabinet officials, officials in the Premier's office, senior House officials and the research departments of the caucuses.

The cost for the installation in every member's office would be approximately \$25,000. That would include installing two additional amplifiers which would be required in order to provide

the boost of power to extend the service throughout the building. The time frame would be during the summer recess. It probably could be undertaken entirely by persons presently on Hansard staff. That is the only information I have.

Mr. Chairman: That is the total one-time capital cost for what must be nearly another 75 units.

Mr. Fleming: We calculated closer to 100 units.

Mr. Samis: When you said 60 officials, how many of those officials are actually members of the Legislature?

Mr. Fleming: When I say 60, it would include former Speakers, but basically the house leaders' offices, the whips--

Mr. Samis: And you said cabinet officials?

3 p.m.

Mr. Fleming: There would be a number of people in connection with the cabinet office that would need to know what was going on in the House. It is the same with the Premier's office. So far, the question of the installation of loudspeakers has been very carefully controlled. There are no loudspeakers in ministers' offices outside the building. There are loudspeakers, by the way, in the ministers' sessional offices inside the building. There has never, as yet, been any decision made by the Office of the Premier that they wanted loudspeakers outside of the building.

Mr. Boudria: I never realized the situation that is being brought before us now. What we are being told is that if I am the critic of Government Services, I speak in the House and that cabinet minister can hear from his office what I say. But if he speaks in the House and I am not there, I am not afforded the same thing. If we are all supposed to be here as members, all elected in the very same manner, I do not think that that is very fair. If I am being told that the Speaker and the whips have them, I do not disagree with that. They have a different reason. But if a cabinet minister has one in his office, then I feel that everyone should have one in his office, by the same token.

Mr. Fleming: It would be in his office in the building, his sessional office.

Mr. Boudria: That is fine. All I have too is an office in this building.

Mr. Chairman: But that is not all he has.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, but they all have sessional offices in this building.

Mr. Chairman: They do not have what might be called working offices in this building.

Mr. Boudria: Do cabinet ministers have an office similar to an office that I would have?

Mr. Chairman: They have one that is similar, but it is not a sessional office.

Mr. Fleming: There are very few sessional offices in the building, so it would be highly limited.

Mr. Samis: If I can just return to the point about officials, there are some people who have these speakers who are not elected officials. Is that right? They are working for elected officials, but they themselves are non-elected and they have access to the speakers in their own offices?

Mr. Fleming: Yes.

Mr. Samis: I think that speaks to the point that Mr. Boudria raised as well, that an elected official does not get the same treatment as a non-elected official in this building. I think that is clearly the case.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Such people as the House leader's executive assistant might have one or the Premier's executive assistant who is following the procedure of what is taking place.

Mr. Fleming: So far it has been really a policy determined by the caucuses. As far as the administration is concerned, we act only on written instructions from either the House leaders or people who have the authorization to ask that they be installed in a particular member's office. I would imagine that it would be the caucuses that would have to resolve whether or not the equipment should be installed or not.

Mr. Hodgson: Could caucus not ask that speakers be installed in the members' offices, but that it come out of their allowance that they get to run their caucus and research?

Mr. Fleming: So far it has not been a question of finance. It has really been a question as to whether the system should be extended throughout the building or not. That really is a policy decision that seems to rest with the senior leadership of the caucuses.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, from what I have observed I think there are enough people that are not in the House at present the way it is. I think if you put speakers in everybody's office, you would hardly have a quorum half of the time. I see nothing wrong with it the way it is, and I certainly do not agree with putting a speaker in everybody's office.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that last argument, with all due respect, is all that relevant. We are all here to do a job. If we do not do it, it is up to our electors to decide that at the end of the term. There may be good reasons to have it or not to have it, but I do not think that that last one, with all due respect, is a valid one.

What I am concerned about--and it is only in the interests of fairness to everybody; again I am trying to get this across in my own mind--is whether the government House leader has something the opposition House leader does not have; whether a cabinet minister is being afforded something that his opposition critic does not have and so on. I am only trying to establish that we are all here to do exactly the same thing in the building. Granted, ministers have some things that are different, but they are in ministerial offices. While we are inside the building we are all supposed to be members of this Legislature. What I am trying to find out is, are we all being treated equally as far as this particular service, or any other service for that matter, is concerned?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I would like to answer that, Mr. Chairman. I believe we are being treated equally. Those who do have the speakers have them because their job entails that they be on top of the procedure that is ongoing in the House. They are the whip, the House leader and indeed the Premier. The others who have them are closely associated with the staff. The Speaker and Deputy Speaker also have them in their rooms.

Mr. Boudria: That applies to all parties?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: It applies to all parties, so they are all the same.

Mr. Boudria: Fine, thank you.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I have not seen them--I have not looked particularly--but I will have to take Mr. Fleming's position on it that the ministers' sessional offices, which many of them use when they are in the building, have speakers. I have never been in any of those offices to see them used.

Mr. Hodgson: Mine never had a speaker in it and it was a sessional office. I have been there for some time.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Yes, there are some that do not. The argument has always been that if you put these speakers outside the physical setting of the chamber itself, we will not attend the chamber, and I think that argument has some merit. Indeed, if we were to go to the speakers in this modern world of electronics, then we would be going only part of the way. There is no reason, physically, why we could not have TV in this building or why we could not hook up to that TV system wherever we might be in the world. That is possible today.

If you start on this little phase of speakers, why not go the full way? It is only a matter of dollars; yet in many people's minds we are certainly outdated ourselves because there are legislatures which even use electronic voting which we do not use as yet.

We could come right down to the whole essence of it. Why not conference calls to conduct a debate? You could extend the argument, once you get into this field, to whatever limits of electronical features. TV, microcircuitry. Anything today is

possible, and in that sense we are certainly outdated in the way we conduct our facilities, but there are certain traditions we maintain.

Unless we go the full circuit, why just one speaker in somebody's office? If we go the next phase--we have a price tag of only \$25,000 here--if you extend it, then the minister will have to be hooked up with the Bell Telephone system to 18 King Street, St. Clair Avenue and out in Scarborough, which will jack up his speaker costs. We are just beginning when you say \$25,000, Mr. Fleming.

Of course I would rather follow tradition and stay where we are unless we are going to go the full limit. Then I can remain in my fine riding of Simcoe Centre, conduct my business from there and watch it on TV when I so desire and drive in only when I want to.

I leave you with that argument. I know it has been put forward before, but I cannot accede to Mr. Swart's suggestion.

Mr. Wrye: I guess I can only agree with about one thing that I have just heard and that is that we are all treated equally--equally badly, I would argue. As a new member of this Legislature, I know there are many things for me to do, many hours of work, and it is not possible to be in the House at all times. I try to be there as often as possible, but there are times when I have to slip back to my office and write letters and go through material to prepare for debate. But even while I am there, it would be very nice if I could hear the debates that were ongoing and find out if there were some matters being raised that were of particular interest to either my city, my constituents or both.

5:10 p.m.

Right now I cannot do that, so I guess as best I can who is coming up. Often during the throne speech I found myself checking with some of the whips to find out who would be the speakers that day because in talking privately with members of all parties I found that there were speakers--far be it from me to suggest from the government side and even from the party on my left--who would be dealing with matters that interested me and that might even give me some enlightenment. Without a speaker in my office, I have a choice. I can be in the Legislature and do whatever work I can there, although it is a little distracting, or I can be in my office and have no idea whatsoever of what has been going on in the Legislature until I pick up Hansard.

I did not realize it was possible, and I am very pleased to learn that Mr. Fleming says we can install these speakers and do it during the summer for a total cost of some \$25,000. I had heard there were many other arguments, and I am glad that we have not heard any of those today. I would hope we would move very quickly to install these speakers. I support the suggestion of the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr. Samis: I agree with what Mr. Wrye has just said. I want to get it clear since I have to report back to my good friend

from Welland-Thorold. He was under the impression, obviously, that this committee had the power to make decisions, but if I get you right, Mr. Fleming, you are saying in our particular case that the leadership of our own caucus could authorize this and that the funds are there. It is totally their decision, and it is up to us in our own caucus to persuade them to do it.

Mr. Fleming: It would be paid for out of legislative assembly funds, but I think the main question would be whether the leadership of the caucuses were in agreement that it should be extended to every member.

Mr. Samis: You are saying it would take the leadership of all three caucuses.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, and I do not know what the reaction would be on that.

Mr. Chairman: Does that step seem appropriate, though? For us to do that, as representatives of our caucus, without really doing any sort of in-depth checking with them into either the history or the reasoning behind it, would not, I think, be doing anyone a great service.

I certainly would be prepared to accept a recommendation that this committee simply report to the three caucuses the subject matter of Mr. Swart's letter and let them, among themselves perhaps if they can agree, make a recommendation to Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Boudria: We would look for the input of the people on the caucus and then bring it back, Mr. Chairman. Is the ultimate decision ours or is it the other way around?

Mr. Fleming: It would have to come to this committee, and it would then have to go to the Board of Internal Economy, where it would have to be finally approved from a financial standpoint.

Mr. Boudria: So there is nothing that stops us right now from saying either that we approve or do not approve of this and sending our recommendation off to the Board of Internal Economy. Am I right?

Mr. Chairman: I understood Mr. Fleming to say, and perhaps he could correct me if I am wrong, that the funding and the principle would be something which would necessitate the agreement of the three caucuses--

Mr. Fleming: I would think so, yes.

Mr. Chairman: --and that that facility may be more properly in their jurisdiction than here. That is not my opinion, I am just trying to clarify it.

Mr. Fleming: My view would be that if the committee decided that it wanted to go along with this, then obviously you would have to make it in your report to the House. The Board of

Internal Economy would then look at it and then, presumably, the representatives on the Board of Internal Economy would discuss it with the caucuses. Conversely, you could have informal discussions with the caucuses in advance of its going to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Boudria: There are representatives here from every caucus right now. Why don't we discuss it at our next caucus meeting and at our next meeting here and decide then, based on the input that we will have from our fellow caucus members, and send that recommendation off to the Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. Chairman: The suggestion then is that we pursue this matter with our own individual caucuses, that a representative of each party bring back the feeling of that caucus to the committee the next time it is discussed and that we accept those as the recommendations and see where we stand at that point.

New business. Mr. Boudria?

Mr. Boudria: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two things I wanted to discuss with you. One of the things was the French Hansard reporting service that we get now; in other words, Hansard reporting service in the French language.

I made my maiden speech and, of course, as my mother tongue is French, a good portion of it was in that language. The English text was available to me within a couple of hours, and the French text came to my office some time the next day, after it was written down by, I gather, some outside help, because they are not so equipped here at this present time.

The text was incomprehensible. You could not understand what I was trying to say according to the written text. We had to get my secretary and the member for Ottawa East, Mr. Albert Roy's secretary together, and it took the two of them half a day to try and figure out what that person had written down, and to make some sense out of it.

I don't know who Hansard reporting service is hiring to do that particular function in the French language. I understand that it is outside help they bring in for the occasion. But I would suggest it is not of very good quality, whoever it is they hire, because the work all has to be taken back again. I have consulted with the same member, Mr. Roy, and he says that is common; whenever we have that service the end result is that way.

I have also consulted--actually, the member for High Park (Mr. Shymko) has approached me and told me he was not pleased when he made his remarks in French. He was telling me that although French is an official language, he got the Italian text and the Polish text and some other language that he had spoken, within minutes, and it took, again, about a day and a half to get the French one. And it did not make any sense when he got it either.

Mr. Chairman: Are you asking that the editor of debates come before this committee?

Mr. Boudria: Well, I am just wondering if that would be the proper procedure.

Mr. Chairman: I have no idea. That would seem the appropriate route to go and we could certainly have Mr. Richardson schedule it for the next meeting, if that is your wish.

Mr. Boudria: The final thing, Mr. Chairman, is on this business of travel that my colleague, the member for Quinte (Mr. O'Neil), referred to a while ago. I just want to bring to the committee's attention that the federal House has now allowed the spouse's airline tickets to be transferred to somebody of the immediate family.

They adopted that federally a few weeks ago. And I don't know, perhaps, for the information of the committee, we could get details of exactly what they determine to be immediate family, because there are different interpretations on exactly what that is. And perhaps we could have that as a useful piece of information.

Along those lines, I just want to suggest to the committee that as a member who lives a great distance from this place, the 52 airline tickets we get are what I consider now to be fairly adequate. I may run out, but it is fairly adequate.

The only thing is the four spousal tickets, I think are a little shy of what is needed. When one thinks of my spouse coming for the opening of the Legislature, and again, for instance, for the Queen Mother's event in July, that means that after three months of being here, half of the tickets have been used.

I think that the number of four perhaps could be increased to something like six. Not to increase the total of 52 tickets for the time being, at least, but just change that four to six may be a little bit more realistic for those of use who can, in no way, drive to this place because it is just too far and impossible. I understand if you live 100 or 150 miles away, well we could just take a car, and that's fine.

Mr. Hodgson: You have railroad tickets. You can use those too.

Mr. Boudria: No, sir. If I could just elaborate on the railroad thing, Mr. Chairman. We have a right to use four railroad tickets for the spouse. From some communities though, such as Ottawa for instance, it takes eight or nine hours by rail, six hours by car, and 50 minutes by plane. You can appreciate that it is almost impossible.

Rail from Ottawa to Toronto is an impossible situation. If you live along Highway 401 where the express trains go by--whatever they are called, Turbo, or something like that--it is very convenient. For instance, from where the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) lives, it is convenient. But from my constituency, as well as from many others, to tell your spouse to use the train is almost like telling her to stay home. It's impossible, she will not do it.

5:20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Boudria, I wonder if we might start to examine something that is event-related. I think particularly the Queen Mother's visit, the state dinner some time in July--July 6 it may be--is not really something that, in my respectful opinion, should be charged against your allocation. The government, as opposed to your party, your constituents, have invited you and your wife to this. They are extending that kind of invitation on behalf of protocol or the state in another area, whether or not that should be excluded or that should be approved individually for your wife.

Those four that you actually use are four that might well be appropriate for the official opening of the Legislature, your maiden speech, something that you personally choose to make use of. I think there may well be a distinction between those things that are command performances, if you will, for members and spouses, and those things that you choose to use at your discretion.

Mr. Boudria: The same result would be achieved essentially, Mr. Chairman. That is another way of looking at it. Certainly, that would be acceptable to me as well, but I just thought to make it nice and simple to leave the total number of 52 tickets the same, and increase the spousal allowance. It does not mean that they have to come six times, it just means that it is a maximum of six, instead of a maximum of four. It sounded simple and easy to administer.

Mr. Chairman: We will bring that back, Mr. Boudria

The committee adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

)



CA20N  
XC 23  
- M 27

Government M-2  
Publications

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

HANSARD FRENCH TRANSCRIPTION;  
PRESS AND MEMBERS' LOUNGES;  
TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Substitution:

Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L) for Mr. O'Neil

Clerk pro tem: Nokes, F.

From the Office of the Legislative Assembly:

Brannan, P., Editor of Debates, Hansard Reporting Service

Hoy, C., President, Press Gallery, Queen's Park

Mitchinson, T., Executive Assistant, Office of Administration

Perry, C., Manager, Members' Food and Beverage Services

Renyi, P., Osgoode Technical Translation Services

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

The committee met at 3:52 p.m. in committee room No. 1.

HANSARD FRENCH TRANSCRIPTION;  
PRESS AND MEMBERS' LOUNGES;  
TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

Mr. Chairman: The committee will come to order. The consultant is here to deal with item three, the Hansard translation services. It has been recommended, with the agreement of the committee, that we briefly stand down items one and two--with Mr. Hoy's permission as well--and deal with item three at this time. Mr. Hoy, do you have any serious time problems that way?

Mr. Hoy: No.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Boudria, do you wish to comment to open the discussion on item three?

Mr. Boudria: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the other day when I asked for the editor of debates to come before the committee, I made a technical error. I was not referring to the translation, but rather the transcription. You will have to pardon my emphasis on the wrong syllables sometimes, but that is the way it is.

On two occasions I have made speeches in French in the Legislature. On both those occasions it took roughly a day and a half before I could get a transcript. Instant Hansard is provided in English within a matter of hours, but not in French. Also, I am asked for the written text in French, but I do not write speeches, just notes from which to speak.

I am wondering what can be done to improve things. I suggest that the conditions are such that we should change the standing orders to disallow speaking in the Legislature in French because it cannot, in my opinion, be done properly with the mechanisms we have there now. If we keep it in the standing orders to allow it, which, of course, is what I favour, then we should provide the necessary staff to do the job. If we cannot provide the necessary staff to do the job properly, we should not state in the standing orders that we allow it.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Brannan.

Mr. Brannan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is true that we have some difficulty with handling French, primarily because there is not a big volume in the French language. I don't really know what the percentage is, but it is a fairly small percentage. For that reason, we do not have any full-time, regular French-speaking

transcribers, reporters or editors. If we did, I suggest that these people would become disenchanted very quickly because they would not be utilized and would get very weary of sitting around waiting for any French debate.

The solution we came to was to contract with a very reputable company in the city, Osgoode Technical Translation Services, which does a great deal of both transcribing and translating in French and other languages. We entered into an agreement with them that any time we had any French we would alert them. They send their people in and handle French expeditiously, though obviously not quite as expeditiously as we handle English, because we have a whole battery of people standing by ready to pounce on the English debates as they are produced.

These people have been extremely good. They have come in very quickly, and most times are there within the hour to handle the French debate. It gets a little bit more difficult in the evening because we sometimes have difficulty making contact. But I honestly do not think we have ever been any later than 24 hours. It is usually available the next morning at the very latest after a day's debate.

This week we had some slight difficulty because of a break-in at Mr. Renyi's premises which delayed the communications involved. But I think the French transcript for Mr. Boudria's Tuesday night remarks was still produced by about noon on Wednesday.

We do, it is true, ask for the text of the French remarks. We do this with English, as a matter of fact. It is a great help to us to have any speeches or prepared texts that we can get hold of. If there are none, we accept that in the usual good grace. It is more important in French because of the unfamiliarity of everyone involved with the language and the fact that we do want to do the best possible job.

Another distinction we make when we are handling French is that we invariably send back the full text of all remarks in French to the member. We do not do that in English. We do not find it is necessary to do it in English. But in French we like to give the member the opportunity to see what has been done so that if, by any chance, we have got the wrong end of the stick or there is any wrong tense or sense involved, it can be corrected.

I really do not know what more we can do, Mr. Chairman. I think we are hiring the best people we can find in the field, the top-flight company that does translation and transcription work for the federal and provincial governments at several levels. They give us excellent service. I think, by and large, the product has met with satisfaction.

I was a little distressed to read Mr. Boudria's remarks at your meeting of May 14 and naturally was anxious to come here and try to straighten things out. I have since got some response from

Mr. Shymko, who does not agree. I am happy to say that Mr. Shymko feels content with the service we have provided him in the French language. I thought he was, as a matter of fact, because he had personally complimented the people doing the job on the kind of work they were doing.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Mancini, do you have a question?

Mr. Mancini: What is the cost of the contract between your department and these people who do the translation for you?

Mr. Brannan: We have a retainer with the company.

Mr. Mancini: What is the retainer?

Mr. Brannan: The retainer is \$3,000 a year. Then anybody who comes in bills the Hansard office at a rate of \$20 an hour for their services.

Mr. Mancini: What was last year's cost? Do you have an idea?

Mr. Brannan: The total cost was probably not more than about \$5,000 or \$7,000.

Mr. Mancini: On top of the retainer?

Mr. Brannan: No, including the retainer.

Mr. Mancini: Could you have those specific numbers tabled with the committee?

Mr. Brannan: Certainly. As a matter of fact, I am almost sure I am right. I think it is \$750 a quarter. Am I not correct?

Mr. Renyi: The retainer is \$250 a month.

Mr. Brannan: Yes. It is \$3,000 a year and \$20 an hour, I am sure.

Mr. Mancini: That includes all the costs associated with translation?

Mr. Brannan: That is transcription, yes.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: That did not include the constitutional debate where we had instantaneous translation on the speaker system.

Mr. Brannan: That was entirely separate. That was done by a company brought in from Ottawa to provide the instantaneous translation. But Osgoode Technical Translation Services did work on our transcripts and on editing as well as transcribing. They provide the editing services as well as the transcription service.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini has the floor.

Mr. Mancini: That is all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Boudria: Just to put a little precision on some of the things which were said, Mr. Chairman, I spoke in the House Tuesday afternoon, not evening, at roughly four o'clock. I was going to leave on Tuesday night for my constituency and I did not. I wanted to have a look at what was reported the next day.

I got the transcript in my office at, I believe, roughly 2:40 the next afternoon. There was a note asking me to have it back to you by four. So, within the hour, I had to get it back to you. I was planning to leave at three o'clock to go to the airport by car and I had to delay that a few minutes so I could review the text. But that is pretty close to 24 hours in that particular case.

In the case of the reply to the throne speech, if you would be kind enough to look at the first draft that was sent to me versus the final one that was printed in Hansard, I think you will find that there were very many mistakes in it. I was speaking of a predecessor of mine whose name was Aurelien Bélanger. This particular person was responsible for abolishing Bill 17 in Ontario, which in French is Bill dix-sept. They reported in Hansard that we were talking about "le bill du siècle," which means bill of the century. I do not think that is adequate.

By the way, I even missed out on that one. It showed up in the final Hansard that way. But there were many others which were corrected. If you still have a copy of the first draft you sent down to me, if you will be kind enough to look at that, I think you will see that it was not done, in my estimation, all that well.

You mentioned that if you were to have personnel for French transcribing, they would get bored if they had nothing to do. Is it not possible to hire somebody who could transcribe either French or English? I have a secretary in my office who speaks both languages and, of course, so do I. Such people do exist. As a matter of fact, she reviews the texts you send to me and translates my press releases and so on. I am sure if she can do that there must be other people who can do that type of thing as well.

Basically, what I am trying to get at is whether it is possible, if somebody should resign from the department, that the replacement could be somebody who is bilingual. Then you would have one person on staff who could do both, without having to go through the expenditure of hiring a full complement of personnel who would, in your words, be bored because there was nothing to do. That way we might save on those high fees. You are telling us that we are paying so much an hour, plus so many thousands of dollars a year right now, for a service which I do not think is accomplishing what it set out to do.

Mr. Brannan: Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to apologize for the error. I was under the impression that you had spoken Tuesday evening.

The general question of bilingual staff is a very good question and a very interesting one. I can assure you that it is virtually impossible to hire staff that can handle the transcription of debates in both languages. We have tried it. I have a completely bilingual secretary who, I am sure, is probably as good as Mr. Boudria's secretary. She is completely incapable of transcribing debates in English, although her English is very good. She has some difficulty transcribing debates in French.

I must point out to you that in Ottawa, where they have this problem and must provide service in both language expeditiously, they have two completely separate staffs. They have an English reporting debate staff and they have a French reporting debate staff for one very good reason, they find that they just are not capable of doing both.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, but Hansard is produced in both languages there.

Mr. Brannan: In case you think I am laying it on a little bit, I must honestly tell you that for someone to transcribe these debates, even in their first language, is quite a trick.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, I can appreciate that.

Mr. Brannan: To transcribe it in a second language--and we have tried it--it does not work.

Mr. Mancini: Is it not on tape?

Mr. Brannan: It is on tape, but it is very difficult sometimes to distinguish. There are interruptions; there are two or three people speaking.

Mr. Mancini: I notice you ignore the interruptions now.

Mr. Brannan: We try, but they are still, unfortunately--

Mr. Mancini: Fortunately or unfortunately, that is a policy that has never really been approved by the members, but I guess that is another matter.

Mr. Brannan: I was going to say that Mr. Renyi has come here. Mr. Renyi is the chief of the service we use, and his staff are extremely well-qualified people in whom we have every confidence. I am afraid that these errors will occur. If we do you the disservice of not getting the material to you in time for you to get it back to us, then we are not doing our job as well as we should. We must make every effort to get that material back to you in time for you to check it because it is sometimes very necessary to have you check it.

In French, rather more than in English, the spellings are affected by the tenses. The word endings are totally different, although the sound may be the same. There are many problems. I think we need somebody of this calibre to do it.

We literally could not hire people of this calibre. They are quite rare and are very well sought after. I will leave it to Mr. Renyi, if he wants to, to tell you what sort of calibre of people he has. But I can assure you that his people work for the federal and provincial governments at many levels. We count ourselves fortunate to obtain their services as readily as we do.

Ms. Copps: J'aimerais savoir si ce serait une bonne idée pour nous comme des députés de faire plus de députation en français. Si ce serait fait en français peut-être qu'on aurait plus de service pour les membres francophones.

Mr. Renyi: Excusez-moi une seconde, je suis un peu dur d'oreille. Est-ce que je peux vous demander de parler un tout petit peu plus fort, parce que j'ai manqué quelque chose.

Ms. Copps: J'ai demandé comme député est-ce que ça serait une bonne idée pour nous de parler plus en français dans la chambre pour avoir plus de services pour les membres, pour les députés français et pour la communauté française en Ontario.

Mr. Renyi: Il faut que je traduise? Si la question s'adresse à moi--

Ms. Copps: Non, la question s'adresse à tout le monde parce que nous sommes ici pour discuter en comité avec tout le monde.

The question that I asked, for those of you who did not catch it, is would you prefer that we speak more in French so that services may be available in French for those members who are French-speaking or who have constituents who are French-speaking? My point is that many of us who do speak French tend not to speak French for the simple reason that there are not the support services available either in committee or in the House.

I think the kinds of problems that Mr. Boudria is suffering are legitimate problems. I do not know whether this is possible, but has the members' services committee ever considered hiring a French-speaking translator who would also be able to do translation work for members? I understand that service is also very slow. If they were able to fill that dual role, it might alleviate the financial distress of hiring a French-speaking person in the House.

Mr. Brannan: That may very well be a very good suggestion. I am really here merely to abide by the standing orders of the Legislature and to do the job according to the specifications detailed there. The way we are doing it, I honestly feel, meets the need adequately.

Mr. Samis: First, on Ms. Copps' point, I want to make the argument that I do not think it is a question of proving any numbers whatsoever in Ontario. It is a fundamental right of a Canadian living in this province de parler dans les deux langues officielles, ce n'est pas une question de privilège.

I want to ask what they do in New Brunswick since they have advanced much further along the road of bilingualism than this province ever will.

Mr. Renyi: I am a little bit hard of hearing. I am sorry, could you repeat that question?

Mr. Samis: Qu'est-ce qu'on fait dans l'assemblée de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick dans une question de traduction d'un échange?

4:10 p.m.

Mr. Renyi: Je ne suis pas expert, je n'ai aucune idée.

Mr. Brannan: They do have two staffs.

Mr. Samis: Two parallel staffs?

Mr. Brannan: They do in New Brunswick. They have a very small volume, but there is no doubt they do provide a completely bilingual service in New Brunswick. We are going there in August to study that system to see how they do it. I shall be interested to know what is involved for them.

They may have access more readily to bilingual people in New Brunswick than we do here. I know we have tried to hire bilingual staff and we do have some bilingual people. I regret that I am not bilingual, but we do have some very good bilingual people in my department. We do not find that they can handle the text in both languages, and so we are still back to square one.

I think the separate staff is the answer. If the Ontario Legislature decides to provide the total service in both languages, it could be provided, and I could give you the numbers and the costs that would be involved.

I must point out to you, even though somebody mentioned that we do not use interjections, we do use interjections. We use interjections where they become part of the debate.

Mr. Mancini: Not at all times, sir. I am sorry to object to you on that, but I could bring you specific examples where that is not true. I wish you would not say that.

Mr. Brannan: You are absolutely right, but let me point this out to you. We do our best to cope with interjections and to respond to them and place them in Hansard when the main speaker responds to them.

The reason we have difficulty doing this is that we only have the reporters in the House. We dismantled the electronic interjection tracks because they were undesirable, and so we really cannot get a full reading on interjections all over the House.

In order to provide the service adequately in French, we would have to provide an extra reporter's table, as they do in Ottawa. We would have to have an English debates reporting table and a French debates reporting table. I would think we would need maybe three or four transcribers and a couple of editors. Off the top of my head, I suppose this probably could be provided for \$250,000. That is basically what you are looking at, and there is no question that it could be done.

I still feel, though, that the main question here is not a financial one. It is a matter that if we did hire this complete staff to provide the French service, frankly we could not keep them challenged. They would be very bored if we did not make a great deal more use of them than we have done in the past five years.

Mr. Samis: Do you see no room for compromise? I can understand what you are saying, but I still come back to the idea that it is an essential right whether it is boring to some people or not. If you admit the financial resources are there--New Brunswick can spend the money and it is a have-not province--do you not foresee any possibility of it?

Mr. Boudria: So are we.

Mr. Samis: Yes, but they will not admit it, nor will they take the money, which is even worse. If they would take the money, we would not have to worry about it.

Do you foresee any compromise between having the staff you think will be excruciatingly bored by their inactivity and a parallel system as they have in Ottawa and, seemingly, New Brunswick?

Mr. Brannan: I think the compromise that we have reached is a very good one and that the service we provide is very good. I think the complaints about the service are, frankly, sporadic. I think most people are satisfied.

Mr. Boudria: Because the speeches are probably sporadic. There are very few of us who bother to speak in French beyond the throne debate and budget debate.

Mr. Brannan: But when you do speak in French, you have first-class people there to handle it.

Mr. Mancini: So I guess Mr. Boudria's comments are disregarded. Is that it?

Mr. Brannan: They are not disregarded, believe me.

Mr. Mancini: That is basically what you told him. You said the complaints are sporadic and the service is perfect. What do you think he is here for, just to while away the time? He is here because of a legitimate concern. Frankly, I do not think you have dealt with it in a very caring fashion.

Mr. Brannan: No, sir. I was asked, is there not a compromise, and I was admitting that this is a compromise. I am sorry it is a compromise, but that is what we have provided it as. I think it is an ideal solution in the situation we find ourselves in.

Mr. Boudria: I do not want to ask for things that are impossible or which will cost the taxpayers of this province a fortune. It is not my reason for being here. I am here to serve my people and not to inconvenience them.

Nevertheless, in order to do that, there are certain things which I feel are required, and there are two things I would like to see done, Mr. Chairman. The first is to look into whether or not there is such a thing as a bilingual transcriber, although you think such a person is not available anywhere. There has to be somebody that can do that type of job in two languages. I was born and raised with two languages in our household at home, and I am sure there are other people who have had that type of education.

Mr. Robichaud, the translator at the House of Commons in Ottawa, translates something like seven or eight different languages. There are people who are fluent in many languages and, inevitably, there must be some people who can transcribe--I am not asking to translate--two languages. You might look to see whether or not such staff is available.

The other thing I would like to see is if, whenever I am speaking in French in the House--and this is, I think, a big compromise--I were to notify you first when it is going to happen, you could then get the transcribing done. For instance, the first time I spoke, which was on the throne speech, I did notify one person on your sta that I would be speaking that night in French.

I do not remember whether it was yourself or who it was, but I did notify them on that particular occasion. I was told by the members you do not have to do that. This is a privilege we have. It is right in the standing orders. Nevertheless, I did it, but still the work was not done in what I consider to be an amount of time equal to that for work done in the English language.

I will just bring it a little further. If, for instance, you are speaking in English in the House and you get Instant Hansard an hour later, you can issue a press release and send it out. Your speech would be two days old by the time you could do that in French. So it is not a service which is provided equally. For news purposes, it is totally invalid.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, just in defence of the system, I have never believed that Hansard is here for the purpose of the news system. If we get down to that, then we are not achieving anything around here. Your words are for here, not for your people at home so that you can issue news releases.

Mr. Boudria: If you do not issue press releases, maybe it is because you don't think your constituents have to be informed.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: It is not Hansard's problem to assist the news media.

Mr. Boudria: Just to respond to that a little bit, Mr. Chairman, regardless of what we use our copies of Instant Hansard for, certainly if they are available for you to do whatever you like to do with it in one language, it should be available to me in an equal amount of time to do whatever I please to do in the other language.

Mr. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a suggestion with a view to the cost. That has to be a factor. You mentioned \$7,000 at the present time. This may not be 100 per cent satisfactory, but it has worked satisfactorily for quite a few years. I have sat around this place a long time and this is the first time this complaint has ever come up. We have had people speaking both French and English in the House, and it has always been satisfactory. There have been no complaints.

I would suggest that if the services are not adequate now, you get us a price on what you think would be the adequate service Mr. Boudria is asking for. Then a majority of this committee could vote to accept it and we will send it on to the Board of Internal Economy for their consideration.

Mr. Brannan: Perhaps I should just explain the mechanics of the operation a little bit to give you some idea why we have the problem. As the debate is proceeding in English, each five-minute segment is taken off as a separate tape and turned over to the transcribing department. We have a battery of at least eight or nine and sometimes 10 transcribers working on that English debate so that each five-minute segment is ready in half an hour to an hour.

We do not normally have more than two or three five-minute segments in French at the most. If there are only 15 minutes of French spoken, we can only bring in one transcriber to work continuously on the French debate, which means that it is produced much later than if there were eight or nine transcribers. I suppose in order to provide an equivalent service in French to the one that we provide in English, we would honestly have to do what they do in Ottawa, that is, completely duplicate the staff.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: On the other compromise which I have suggested, which would be to notify you first, if that was done, do you think that the service would then be quicker than what it is now? For instance, if you knew in the afternoon that I would speak that evening, instead of having to call somebody after I spoke to start the work, which then could only be started three or four hours later, it could be started immediately.

Certainly an amount of time would be gained, and I am sure that would not add an exorbitant amount of cost. Whether you come and start the work right away or four hours later, you still have to do it.

Mr. Brannan: Absolutely, it would help, yes. It would mean we could have somebody there ready to pounce on it as soon as the debate has commenced.

Ms. Copps: In view of perhaps attempting to solve Mr. Boudria's problem, I wonder if we might entertain a motion that, given the kind of notice that we have talked about--and perhaps 12 hours might be an effective time span--if a member gives 12 hours' notice to the transcribing service, the transcribing service would then have someone on hand who would be able to offer as equivalent to a simultaneous transcription service as possible to our French-speaking members.

Mr. Hodgson: One of the problems with that is you might notify Hansard you are going to be on in 12 hours and you might not even get on until the next day or next week. That is one of your problems.

Mr. Boudria: It is still cheaper than having somebody here full time.

Mr. Hodgson: We have not heard any serious complaints from you as far as the system we have now goes. They are minor ones.

Ms. Copps: But the complaint is that he is not and we are not receiving the kind of service that we should be giving to our constituents of francophone extraction.

Mr. Hodgson: You have a big French population in your riding, do you?

Ms. Copps: As a matter of fact I do, yes. The Centre Français is in my riding, et cetera.

Mr. Hodgson: But they can read English too, I imagine.

Mr. Chairman: Let us address the committee through the chair, please.

Mr. Hodgson: I am only thinking about that \$243,000 extra that we are going to spend to provide a complete service and I think that is worth consideration.

Ms. Copps: I am moving a motion, in deference to the cost to set up a full translation service, that on 12 hours' notice members be supplied a transcriber of French in the House.

Mr. Mancini: I have a question on the motion.

Mr. Hodgson: Do you know what that will cost you?

Ms. Copps: If you want to do it on an experimental basis, let us try it from now until the end of the session and see how it works.

Mr. Hodgson: You have to know the cost factor because it has to be approved by the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini has a question on the motion.

Mr. Mancini: Is this going to be a supplementary motion to the suggestion made by Mr. Boudria that we look for a bilingual person to transcribe?

Ms. Copps: No, this is the first motion.

Mr. Mancini: Is that other idea forthcoming?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, if the question is being asked of me, I will also make a motion to investigate whether bilingual transcribers are available.

Mr. Mancini: That is what I was getting at.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I could try to bring some degree of conclusion to this for the moment. Let us look at the history of it very briefly for the moment. A member of the Legislature had a problem with the service as it exists. As a result of that, it was brought before this committee. Mr. Brannan and Mr. Renyi were invited in to try to assist us with that problem. I think what we want to do is resolve the problem, if there is a legitimate problem.

Mr. Brannan, it behooves me to ask you, sir, whether or not you feel that on the basis of the comments you have heard this afternoon and on the previous background material that you have had available to you, it would be to our benefit, in your opinion, to leave this with you for a week or two and let you come back with what might be a solution to the immediate problem that is at hand.

Mr. Brannan: I think I can tell you right away that having notice of French being spoken would certainly expedite it somewhat because we could have people on hand to do the job without any trouble. Frankly, having had experience of this over a number of years, I do not think we could find an adequate number of completely bilingual people available to us to do this work.

Perhaps this may not sound like a very legitimate suggestion, but to indicate some of the difficulties we presently have perhaps the next time a member who has a bilingual secretary speaks French, that bilingual secretary could come up to Hansard to transcribe the tape and see how we make out.

Mr. Chairman: I think you are going to find immediately that that falls somewhat outside the availability of time.

Mr. Boudria: My secretary already has to translate all kinds of other things. Even the research offices of my party--and I am sure it is the same with others--in the case of any information which they supply to us which I have to give back my constituents, they already have to translate all of that. I would suggest that my secretary perhaps has a lot more to do than other secretaries who do not have to do this translation.

Ms. Copps: Than to do the job of Hansard.

Mr. Brannan: Please do not misunderstand me. I was not making this suggestion as a continuing thing. I merely suggested it as an indication to members involved how difficult it was to find people who are capable of bilingual transcription. No way was I suggesting that--

Mr. Chairman: I think if you rest at that point, Mr. Brannan, we may save further difficulties on that point.

Mr. Mancini: From all the evidence we have heard today, some being given by Mr. Brannan and other evidence by Mr. Boudria, I do not think we are going to solve the problem by leaving it in Mr. Brannan's hands because I do not believe that he perceives the problem to be that significant.

Secondly, I think that the members' concerns should be expressed through this committee by way of motion and, therefore, have the process carry on once the motion is dealt with. That would be my concluding remark, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: If I could make one comment on Ms. Copps' motion relating to the matter of 12 hours' notice or any notice at all, I can foresee a situation not very far down the road. It may well be that if Ms. Copps uses the second official language or Mr. Boudria or someone else, who has been part of the decision-making process gives 12 hours' notice, or as best they can, that is fine. But I foresee that the very first time somebody forgets, fails, chooses not to or whatever to give the 12 hours' notice suggested by this motion, immediately a great hue and cry will go up that once again we are not providing a service. With great respect, I do not think that is likely to cure the problem in the long run.

Mr. Mancini: Can I make a recommendation then? Why do we not just make a motion to see if we can find a person who is able to do the dual transcribing, as Mr. Boudria suggested?

Mr. Chairman: I was attempting to get to the point of Mr. Brannan. Whether he personally accepts what the members are saying or not is really beyond the point. The point is that he is responsible, as are all members or all officers of the assembly, to take forth the wishes pertaining to the standing orders or changes in the standing orders.

We, as a committee dealing with members' services, have identified a problem. When I asked him earlier if he thought it would be helpful for him to make alternative suggestions, I was

hoping he might take that in the spirit of its becoming a recommendation to facilitate it. If he is not in a position to do that, I do not take that away from him necessarily. I think it then becomes up to us either to find a workable, long-term solution or to specifically start exploring a number of alternatives.

Again, with great respect, I do not know that putting a motion that simply talks in terms of 12 hours' notice is really going to accomplish much in the long term.

Mr. Mancini: Can we hear Ms. Copps' motion again?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Ms. Copps has moved that on 12 hours' notice members be supplied with a French language transcriber in the House.

Mr. Boudria: May I speak to the motion? Of course, I recognize that this is not perfect. This is a compromise between what I think was suggested by the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), who said that we should be provided with the same service which is offered in New Brunswick, and the position of leaving it exactly the way it is, I think this for a very low cost may provide some improvement.

Granted, in order to have the service the same as it is in English, you would have to have, as was mentioned, perhaps an equal complement. I just think this is a compromise. Two or three years down the road we may say this is still inadequate, but at least the money would be saved between having that and having a full complement of personnel to do the work in the French language.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Hodgson: While we are in this area, do we have to take into consideration any other language that is spoken, Italian or anything like that?

Mr. Brannan: No, Mr. Chairman. The standing orders only require us to transcribe remarks in English and French. If a member speaks in any other language, we invite them to provide a translation to place in Hansard, but we are not called upon to transcribe languages other than French and English.

Mr. Chairman: Again, if I may, what we are talking about here is not an error in the conduct of Mr. Brannan or his staff as it relates to the standing orders. We are talking about his method and we are trying to find a more efficient way or a more effective way of providing the second language service.

Once again, is it implicit in your motion that those who do not choose to take advantage of the 12 hours' notice period are left with what exists now?

Ms. Copps: Yes.

Mr. Boudria: It is a modest improvement, I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I just want to make sure that we are not setting up another artificial situation which will bring us back here again.

Mr. Boudria: It may.

Mr. Chairman: It may indeed.

Mr. Brannan, are such people available as are described in this motion, people that would be available to this House on 12 hours' notice?

Mr. Brannan: Yes, I think we could bring them in. If we knew that a member was going to speak in French, I think we could make some prior arrangement with the service that there would be a transcriber on hand in order to do the transcription.

Mr. Chairman: Would they in reasonable similarity be able to provide the same kind of service that the English Hansard service provides now by way of time?

Mr. Brannan: It would depend entirely on the length of the remarks. If it got at all lengthy, we would need a lot more than the people we have available to us now in order to do it. As I explained, supposing somebody got up and spoke in French for an hour, as they did during the constitutional debate, we would then need a battery of French-language transcribers in order to handle that as quickly as we handle the English.

We would do the best we could, obviously, and hope to provide an acceptable service. Normally, members do not speak for that length of time in French; normally, it is only four or five paragraphs. Usually, one transcriber is enough to handle that. I hope we would be able to provide the required service.

Mr. Chairman: Just before I go to Mr. Taylor, may I ask if that might be included within the financial arrangement that we have now?

Mr. Brannan: Yes, I think it could because it still works out to an hourly rate.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Are there any instructions presently as to the time frame within which you have to have your English-language transcriptions out?

Mr. Brannan: Not specifically. We do promise to get the English out in the main chamber between two and four hours. In committees it is sometimes 36 hours to two days, depending upon the backlog of work. There is no specific undertaking, but that is generally the kind of time frame we are looking at for English debates. It can be as fast as an hour.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: That is on the Instant Hansard, as it is called.

Mr. Brannan: That is right.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Other than the procedure that has built up over a period of time, there has been no definite instruction that you have to have it out within a particular time frame?

Mr. Brannan: No, there has not.

Mr. Hodgson: I have just one more question. To whom is this a recommendation that this committee is making?

Mr. Chairman: We are just discussing that at this very moment. I would suggest it is a recommendation to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Hodgson: Mr. Brannan would have no authority here?

Mr. Chairman: The clerk of the committee is now checking to see if Ms. Copps is willing to make that direction.

Ms. Copps: I am sorry, I did not hear what you said.

Mr. Chairman: I am just trying to determine whether the motion before the committee is one that we can directly act upon or whether we can instruct Hansard to do anything.

Ms. Copps: I would amend the motion to direct that we recommend it to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Chairman: It would be the recommendation of this committee to the Board of Internal Economy that on 12 hours' notice--

Mr. G. W. Taylor: To investigate the possibility.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, to investigate the possibility.

Is everyone familiar with the motion?

Ms. Copps: Could you reread the motion, please, because I didn't put "to investigate the possibility" in it?

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Copps moves that this committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy they investigate the possibility of providing--

Ms. Copps: No, that they provide.

Mr. Chairman: I will try again, then.

Ms. Copps moves that this committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that on 12 hours' notice members be supplied with a French transcriber in the House.

Any further comments on the motion?

Those in favour?

Those opposed?

Motion negated.

Mr. Mancini: In other words, you are voting against it, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Mancini: Are you even afraid to send it to board when you have a huge majority?

Mr. Chairman: Any further motions on the item?

Ms. Copps: Just for the record, are all the members who are here from the government side regular members of the committee?

Mr. Chairman: They certainly are.

Mr. Hodgson: Are all the Liberals regular members of the committee?

Mr. Mancini: Ms. Copps is duly substituting. Don't worry.

Ms. Copps: I have a further motion.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Copps moves that this committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that it investigate the possibility of offering a transcription service to members on 12 hours' notice.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Taylor may prefer that wording.

Mr. Mancini: That is just like the original wording.

Mr. Chairman: But it recommends instead of directs.

Ms. Copps: Right.

Mr. Hodgson: Then the responsibility would be on the members to give 12 hours' notice.

Mr. Chairman: Not if they want that service.

Motion agreed to.

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: Never let it be said.

Thank you, Mr. Renyi and Mr. Brannan.

Ms. Copps: Thank you. Merci.

Mr. Mancini: Grazie.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hoy, we have detained you long enough.

Dealing with item two as part of the larger matter of the members' services on the food and beverage operations, Mr. Hoy is here to make representation on behalf of the press gallery.

Mr. Hoy: I haven't that much formally to say--isn't that nice?--other than I have this report from Mr. Perry. The press gallery has a couple of concerns with it.

Last year the same sort of thing came up and Mr. Haliechuk, who was president at that time, expressed a similar concern. The phrase "net loss" for a service is one that we find difficult to accept in that net loss is considered somebody's salary for a service. There may be some who consider salaries as a loss for people who are providing a service, but there may be some who consider everybody's salary a net loss to the public, for example, your salaries. I have often considered that, I suppose, but in the context--

Interjection: And yours.

Mr. Hoy: That's true. Mine isn't high enough.

I do not think it is particularly fair or appropriate to label as a loss the salaries in our case of two stewards and in the case of the other lounges, which I am not speaking about, of all the stewards. I can understand, I guess, the mentality of a bean counter, but it is not anything that we accept as a useful way to describe somebody who is doing a service for which the government pays. It's somebody's salary. If you call that a net loss, the government spends \$2 billion a year as a net loss on salaries.

4:40 p.m.

In terms of the long-term suggestion of closing the lounge, before I get into that, the thing that I think has to be understood is that--and I think there is a suggestion in here for Mr. Perry--to transfer the cost of the press lounge to some other account, which really does not concern us that much, it should be understood that in the case of the stewards working in the lounge, providing food and beverage services is just part of what they do--roughly half. It is not really split 50-50; it varies. Of course, a big part of what they do is to take around the press releases that I think Mr. Boudria referred to earlier, and Mr. Taylor made a scurrilous remark about the press.

Mr. Chairman: You intend to be provocative of course.

Mr. Hoy: That's true. Part of what they do is to deliver those releases which we then either discard or write stories about.

Mr. Mancini: Usually it's the former.

Mr. Hoy: I can understand Mr. Perry being concerned about that. It is probably legitimate from his point of view, but I do not think it is fair to call that a net loss either--delivering press releases and all that sort of thing.

We would be concerned at any move because as you all know one steward is retiring this year. We would be a little concerned about any move to cut him back. I know last year there was some talk about having the one steward, Jimmy, and then when Sam retires having a part-time person from 10 to three or something. Unfortunately, the news business does not necessarily work from 10 to three. Sometimes things happen at night; sometimes they happen in the morning. I don't think that would be very appropriate or useful.

The difficulty is that the press release service is not just a service to the media generally, which of course it is. It is also a service obviously to those people who are putting out the releases. They want us to get them and use them. So we are a little concerned about any move to cut back the service.

I see here in long-term suggestions the suggestion of a feasibility study of relocating the members' lounge and the press gallery lounge to the southeast side in the basement level of the main building. It says that it would be "a more convenient location for members." I don't know which members. I didn't know that members go down to the basement other than to go to the dining room.

Mr. Boudria: The members' lounge is in the north wing.

Mr. Hoy: I know where the members' lounge is. It is a route march to get to it.

Mr. Boudria: That's why we want to move it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hoy, please continue.

Mr. Hoy: I would be quite happy to talk about the members' lounge, but that is not really one of our concerns.

The fact of the matter is that our lounge, while it is called the press lounge, is used by an awful lot of people who are not members of the press gallery. It is a public lounge in the sense of public being everybody who works in the building.

All the Hansard people use it. Politicians use it, although in our view not enough. We keep inviting them, but they won't come. All sorts of people who work in this building come in and use the lounge because it happens to be by far the most convenient location in this place if you want to drop in for a quick libation or something. We are right beside the chamber, which is far more convenient than any other place.

That is really the only point I wanted to make. We do not consider salaries as a loss and we are not happy about any thought of closing our lounge apparently with the view of balancing the books and perhaps the wrong books.

Mr. Boudria: I have just one observation. All of those remarks, Mr. Hoy, are made in the context of the restaurant

operation. When you talk about the salary being a loss, it is a loss to the restaurant operation, not necessarily a loss in so far as the quality of service rendered to the members or to the press gallery or to both.

What we asked Mr. Perry to do when he explained to this committee at the previous meeting that there were people charged to his department--in other words, deducted from the profitability of his operation--who were not doing restaurant work as such all the time, was to make recommendations as to what to do with this. Of course, his remarks are there to explain that they should not be charged to the restaurant.

This committee has not suggested yet that we should not provide the press gallery with services that they require. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, we did not bring that up at the last meeting. But we did say that if this staff was not used by the restaurant, it was ridiculous that their salaries be charged to the restaurant if they were not working there.

Mr. Hoy: Yes. As I said, I do not care where you have them. We do not have any complaints about it if you want to get into a bookkeeper's argument about which ledger we should be in.

Mr. Boudria: That is what this addresses of course.

Mr. Hoy: No, it addresses a little more than that. With due respect, he is talking about closing the press gallery lounge. He has got a long-term suggestion, which I can read right in front of me here, which is a little more than talking about changing accounts from one ledger to another.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: There are two features of it, Mr. Boudria. There is the one feature that there is one individual who is labelled a steward and who also performs other functions more related to the distribution of paper and it is hard to cost account the time frame in that. But the second part of your question is accurate, I think. What we are looking at is, does the entire cost of operation charged against the restaurants make it worthy of keeping it open? It is costing \$35,000 to dispense liquor, food and information services from that geographical location in the building, cost accounting the way it is done presently. Is that worthy of a government expenditure for the people who use that location.

Whether or not one moves that place physically from there to co-ordinate activities, in each one of the situations, Mr. Hoy, it appears to be a question of staff salaries--and I want to make it very clear at this point that we in no way want to diminish the staff or to do away with their jobs, but to try to co-ordinate it so as to get the best production out of those salaries.

I know one individual is ready for retirement. We do not want to do and have no consideration of doing away with that individual's job before his retirement. I am sure I recall your writing about this subject, the deficit in running the dining room

and the other things, and they are all included in that dining privilege. That is the area we are trying to zero in on.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure that Mr. Hoy will take in good conscience that we are not trying to diminish the service. I am sure the committee would be pleased to hear any comments you may have on either the quantity or the quality of the service which exists at this time in your lounge, not only the accounting of it.

Mr. Hoy: It would certainly be diminished if it was relocated down in the basement, yes. You are going to have the stewards distributing press releases. They get 20, 30 and 40 press releases a day being distributed. Are you going to take them all to the basement and then have them lug them up?

Mr. Chairman: Your comments are well taken and they make sense. As your operation is right now, from a food and beverage standpoint, ignoring what else the staff may be doing, are the quantity and the quality of your food and beverage service suitable or unsuitable to the press gallery? Are there areas that you can suggest for improvement?

We are here as a committee to try to evaluate and look at the whole matter of food and beverage service as it is available to those users of it through members' services. Do you have any comments about your existing service at this time?

Mr. Hoy: Yes, sure. Before I do though, I have been around here too long to completely ignore any suggestion which is made. Just because it may not be favourable today, it may be six months from now. So I wanted to put our objections on the line--

Mr. Chairman: They're on the record.

Mr. Hoy: --before this became considered and before somebody thinks that this is a marvellous idea six months from now, which has been known to happen--and vice-versa.

I think that generally we wish more members would use the service. I know there is a recommendation to close the members' lounge, which is something that we are not really prepared to comment on, other than if they did probably then there would be more members in our lounge. I think our lounge is the most conveniently located. We do not have any serious complaints. As I say, when Sam retires I am a little concerned that, in looking at a service as a balance sheet, there might be an overwhelming desire to cut back the service and have one or one and half stewards, rather than two. As it exists, there are not any serious complaints that I am aware of.

Mr. Hodgson: I have been up there quite a few times and I do not think you would get along without two.

Mr. Hoy: No. We could not.

Mr. Hodgson: Or any less service than is provided to you at the present time.

Mr. Hoy: We could not. As it exists, I do not think there is any great unhappiness about it.

Ms. Copps: As I am a substitute on this committee and not having been privy to the discussions on the subject last week, as a connoisseur of food and libation, I would suggest that this committee go along with the recommendation which was made to close the members' lounge and move everybody up to the press lounge. If you have been in either one or the other, the members' lounge is certainly not conducive to the kind of conversation we would like to have and the press lounge is.

Mr. Hodgson: Ms. Copps, I do not think there has been a suggestion from what has been considered and talked about that we close the members' lounge downstairs.

Mr. Boudria: There was no resolution, but it certainly was under discussion.

Mr. Chairman: It was under discussion. Are there further questions of Mr. Hoy?

Mr. Samis: Do you have any room for expansion eastward? I am just trying to think what is east of here. If we were to close the members' lounge, obviously it would increase the demand on your facilities. What is the third room along there?

Mr. Hoy: There is a little office to the east, the room where we put the food when we have parties. The next office to that is the London Free Press office.

Mr. Mancini: Is there room for them if we relocate them?

Mr. Hoy: Yes.

Mr. Mancini: It would not be a big deal.

Mr. Hoy: Then beyond that, there is a Thomson office. But that gets into a very large office and that gets into an area of three or four people, and it is far more difficult to find space for three or four people. The office right next door just has one person. I had not really considered that. It is not that big anyway.

Mr. Mancini: Really?

Mr. Chairman: Will the committee have any more specific questions for Mr. Hoy or on the press gallery aspect before we hear from Mr. Perry?

Mr. Hodgson: I have expressed my views on it. I do not think the Conservatives would curtail in any way.

Mr. Chairman: That is not the objective. The objective is to find out what we are doing right.

Interjections.

Mr. Hodgson: I would make a suggestion to this committee. Before we really take a firm stand, the members should be polled to see which members use the members' lounge and how much.

Mr. Chairman: All right. But that relates to the whole question. Are there any further comments or anything else from Mr. Hoy? Thank you, Mr. Hoy.

Do the members all have before them a copy of Mr. Perry's report, dated May 25, 1981? Mr. Perry, do you want to go over it briefly chapter and verse and see where we get to?

Mr. Perry: First of all, I would like to apologize to Mr. Hoy. I was always brought up to believe that if one's sales are less than one's costs, one ends up with a net loss. But perhaps deficit would be a better term. Also, it was never my suggestion that we close the press gallery, just that we relocate it.

Mr. Chairman: I think that is what he afraid of. I do not think he would dare to suggest that anyone thought we might close it.

Mr. Perry: Do all members have a copy of this?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. All members have a copy.

Mr. Mancini: Can we go through this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest we do page by page and number by number. You are on.

Mr. Mancini: We are right with you, Mr. Perry.

Mr. Perry: At the request of the members, I broke down the cost areas into stewards' area and food area. Page one comprises the cafeteria and dining room and page two the press gallery, members' lounge and dining room services for stewards. I am open for questions anytime.

Mr. Chairman: By way of policy, because we have not really done this in this committee, do you want to take the report apart at your leisure as we go, or do you want to save it and let him do a section at a time? What is your wish?

Mr. Samis: Perhaps Mr. Perry should address it in general terms and then we will move into whatever the members are interested in. I think Mr. Perry should be given a chance to make some statement first.

Mr. Chairman: If members will just try to keep that in mind, I am sure there will be natural places to insert questions rather than interrupting.

Mr. Perry: Following our meeting two weeks ago, administration agreed to remove the cost of one of the stewards from my food service and relocate that charge to administration. That means that the press gallery charge or deficit is now only \$15,000, not \$35,000. One of the major problems has always been within the food service area, that we do have so many locations. Up to the present date, there has been no agreement as to whether to close any services down or amalgamate the services or even where we will relocate the services. I am hoping that after these meetings we will get some direction as to which way we intend to go.

Mr. Boudria: On the members' lounge in the north wing, I think it is evident that this money is not very well used at this time, that is, the amount that is spent for the benefit we get. I think the whole members' lounge situation is actually terrible. It seems as though we are keeping a whole facility operative for only a few people who want to go there and have a libation when they could go elsewhere. Meanwhile, we are keeping the dining room closed two nights a week because we cannot afford to keep it open.

I would suggest that we move quickly on that whole business of the members' lounge to put that whole thing out of its misery. You go down there and there only one or two people sitting down having a sandwich. Many times they are not members at all, and it is supposed to be a members' lounge. Whichever member goes there, I suggest could just as easily go to the press gallery.

Mr. Hodgson: This is why I suggested--

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Boudria has the floor.

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps it would be interesting to hear what the member has to say on it. I would suggest that be done for the amount the facility is used, compared to how those funds could be used elsewhere to improve other facilities, such as the restaurant, keeping it open on nights when it is closed right now.

Those of us who live out of town, as I mentioned at the last meeting, do not go home for dinner. We are here for the week and we are obviously not able to get those services one might expect, such as the facilities to eat here on two nights in the week, that is, Monday and Wednesday. Meanwhile, there are facilities being kept open, such as the members' lounge, and nobody uses them. I would submit that it is more important to have a place to eat than to have a place to drink.

Mr. Mancini: I guess we are limiting our conversation right now to the members' lounge aspect.

Mr. Chairman: We are not really, no. Let me offer another suggestion by way of proceeding right at the moment. You have before you a sheet with about four items in the report. It is headed short-term suggestions. If Mr. Perry addresses himself to these for a few minutes, or if members of the committee want to address themselves specifically to those recommendations and suggestions, that may get us to some conclusion.

5 p.m.

Mr. Mancini: The only thing I want to try to make clear at the outset is that basically I believe all members would like to have a members' lounge where they could go with some confidence and conduct private conversations without being overheard by just anybody, where they could go and relax for a few minutes during some of the long days we have here.

With regard to the situation now as far as the members' lounge in the north wing is concerned, first of all, I do not think it is very attractive and it certainly does not attract anybody down there. It is not very private; therefore, it does not serve the purpose of having a group of members get together to discuss a particular problem or just to relax. I agree with Mr. Boudria that it really is not serving its purpose.

But at the same time, I think we should have some facility in the building where, if you and I, for example, Mr. Perry, want to go and discuss some business for five minutes we can do it casually over some mineral water or something else. I want to re-emphasize the points made by Mr. Boudria, but also state that we should have some facility available in the buildings. It should be available when we know the members are around. Members are here from Monday to Friday, and most of us work late every night. It does not matter whether the House is closed or not. That is the only comment I would like to add.

Mr. Samis: Just going on from what Mr. Mancini said, I think from the way this House is going the existence of a members' lounge is necessary beyond any shadow of a doubt in terms of its need and value. Can you give me some figures? If we follow this proposal and close down the existing one completely, what is the actual seating capacity of that press lounge? It strikes me as being somewhat limited, is it not?

Mr. Perry: Yes, it is. This has always been the problem. The members' lounge is in the most inferior location it could possibly be. The press lounge is in probably the prime location in the building, but it is too small to expand unless some of the press give up space so we can expand it to make it a dual lounge. Or, the first suggestion I made was that if we are going to expand that area so that the members can have a lounge also on that level, then we put one bar in to divide the lounge into two so that one barman can look after them both, whilst both parties still have their own facilities.

Mr. Samis: I think members would appreciate some possibility for some confidentiality. I am sure the press would want the same. But what are the comparative seating capacities now? Do you have any figures on that--guesstimates?

Mr. Perry: I would guess that the press lounge holds possibly about 30 people, using everything and the members' lounge holds about 70 or 80 people, if you use all those chairs around the edges.

Mr. Samis: So it would seem to me that if we were to close the members' lounge, it is really incumbent upon Government Services or somebody to provide for either an expansion or relocation as the existing press gallery cannot accommodate the numbers. New rules obviously would have to be drawn up for members and friends and guests. Secondly, can you tell me if there was any plan drawn up or if you are aware of any plan for the existing bunker location? Somebody told me there were some plans for a British-style pub which has never been implemented and has never been attempted. Are you aware of any such thing?

Mr. Perry: We asked MGS to do this, but they came up with a figure of \$80,000, so nothing was carried forward. It was dropped.

Mr. Chairman: On that very point, just before we go to Mr. Hodgson, I had a meeting earlier this week with Mr. Wiseman, the Minister of Government Services, and we discussed possible alternative uses for that north wing lounge area. We had too much on the agenda today to try to bring that up as well, but if it is your wish, he and his ministry are certainly prepared to come before this committee the next time, and we can have a discussion about the alternative uses for that space.

Mr. Hodgson: I would suggest that as we have representation here from all caucuses we should take this back to our caucus, as far as the closing or the use of the members' lounge in the north wing is concerned. At one time it was used very extensively by all members of all parties.

I would not like to see it closed. I think Mr. Mancini said it is necessary to have some place, and the press gallery is not the place, for a member to go and discuss private business. In the years past, there have been a lot of minor slips of the tongue up there and the next day it is a headline in the paper. I do not want to see that happen again.

Mr. Samis: They would probably have a whole new column--foibles and fables from the bar.

Mr. Hodgson: I also think that before we make any suggestions we should discuss with our caucuses the question of continuing food services on Monday and Wednesday nights to see how many use it. If there are only going to be six to 12 members using it, it is not worth while keeping the kitchen open.

Mr. Boudria: Yet it is worth while keeping the members' lounge open when there is nobody in it.

Mr. Hodgson: The members' lounge closes at 6:30.

Mr. Boudria: There is nobody there in the daytime. One half hour after the House closes, the members' lounge closes.

Mr. McLean: I am rather disappointed in this report that has been brought in. I think the last day we asked for a proposal

indicating how the costs were allocated. I would like to see the number of people on the payroll--how many waitresses, hostesses and bartenders there are and what salaries these people are being paid. When we have a detailed report on the amount of staff in these areas, I would have a far easier time making a decision on where we should and should not be cutting back.

I also support what our chairman has mentioned to Mr. Wiseman with regard to changes. I would like to see the whole committee take a look at the barber shop and the area offices there, to see if that cannot be utilized as a members' lounge, using the dining room bar. That would cut down on staff. I would like to see a more detailed report as we requested at the last meeting.

5:10 p.m.

Mr. Hodgson: I have just one more question, Mr. Chairman. Where is it recorded what it is costing us for coffee for the committee room and for the east and west galleries? This is service that you have added since 1977.

Mr. Perry: It is under the Speaker's budget. I charge the Speaker for all the coffee in the lobbies.

Mr. Hodgson: That does not show here.

Mr. Perry: It shows under catering. That is part of my income.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Is it also the same thing for committees?

Mr. Perry: Yes. All coffee service throughout the building, every product delivered from my kitchens, is charged to the committee.

Mr. Hodgson: The next time we have a meeting, could you give us an estimate of what that is costing us? I would like to see that broken down because out of a whole pot coffee maybe only seven or eight cups are taken.

Ms. Copps: Regarding the members' lounge, I think you have given us a breakdown; not in terms of the numbers of employees, but labour, et cetera, is shown on the cost breakdown.

Where do you get \$16,000 for food in the members' lounge? I did not even know they had food there. Does that include parties, or is that strictly the food that is sold?

Mr. Perry: That is strictly food--coffee, sandwiches, pie--that we sell in the members' lounge.

Mr. Mancini: Who provides that?

Mr. Perry: I do. I send it from my kitchen.

Mr. Mancini: You charge them and they pay your kitchen?

Mr. Perry: That is right. It is taken off my inventory.

Mr. Mancini: Do you sell it at cost?

Mr. Perry: Basically, yes.

Mr. Samis: I have a question related to the whole question of the members' lounge. I notice at the bottom of the page your suggestion "in conjunction with the closure of..." Can you expand a bit on your idea of using the dining room as an alternative or extension or substitute for the members' lounge, what it entails and what you would foresee in terms of its operation?

Mr. Perry: The members' lounge during the day is basically used by members of the library staff and staffs in the north wing. In the evening, the average of sales after five o'clock in the members' lounge was \$25, and I have a steward on from five o'clock to 10:30 minimum. What I suggested is that even if we do not close the members' lounge during the day, we close it in the evening and keep the bar in the members' dining room open until 10:30. There is a steward there anyway until eight o'clock, so all it is going to cost is an extra two and a half hours.

Mr. Samis: Would you make any adjustments or refinements in the seating if you were to operate on that basis?

Mr. Perry: I really could not. The problem is the dining room is set up obviously as a dining room. All I could do is to strip the tables near the bar so the people could sit there and be served.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, I would like to see us get to the end of this.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McLean moves that the committee be provided with a detailed report with regard to the amount of staff and the salaries that are paid to the staff in detail, such report to be available for the next meeting.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Perry, are you prepared to bring that report back in a week or two weeks?

Mr. Perry: I would like to clarify. You would like a breakdown of all salaries paid by steward services and catering services, by department?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Time frame, Mr. Perry?

Mr. Perry: Two weeks.

Mr. Chairman: At that time we will have Mr. Wiseman come in as well with possible alternative uses of the north wing location.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Possible short-term suggestions might between now and then be discussed with the individual caucuses.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I might say to the committee I hope that we could move something on out of this committee possibly at the next meeting or not too much further down the road. Otherwise, we are going to be here until the end of the session and not have accomplished anything. We do not want that to happen, do we?

Ms. Copps: So the next meeting is two weeks from today.

Mr. Chairman: No, this item will be coming back to this committee two weeks from today.

Item four is travel allowance. We will move back to that. Mr. Boudria, I believe that was yours as well.

Mr. Boudria: It seems as though I want all kinds of innovations here, Mr. Chairman. I am being credited or blamed for a lot of them, but that is okay.

I read the note that was sent to us and I recognize the content of it, but nothing stops this committee from recommending to the Board of Internal Economy what we would like to see. In looking at it a little bit, I think what we should try to do is leave the number of trips at 52 for the time being, perhaps changing the spousal allowance of trips from four to six, if the committee will agree to that. It does not change the total number of trips in one year; it just leaves it at 52. It makes it a little more realistic, I think, for a spouse to be able to come here three times in a session instead of two.

We did discuss the other day events such as the Queen's visit and this type of thing. There must be some provisions made where one can bring his or her spouse to Toronto sometimes. Some of us live very far away, and it is not even possible to drive here readily. It is 270 miles from my place to here, and driving that distance is a rather tiresome task. I do it sometimes to save airline tickets so that I will be able to last the year on my 52 tickets.

Nevertheless, if the total number of tickets was not changed but left at 52, and if a quantity of six were to be allowed for the spouse instead of four--that is, a maximum of six out of those 52--that would certainly keep me happy, Mr. Chairman. We could recommend that to the committee.

Mr. Hodgson: You are saying leave it at 52 and leave it to the member how he uses them, whether he uses part of those 52 for his spouse or a member of his family.

Mr. Boudria: No.

Mr. Hodgson: You are not talking about six extra on top of the 52.

Mr. Boudria: That is right. The way it works right now is that we are allowed a maximum of 52 tickets. Of those 52, we are allowed to use a maximum of four for our spouse. What I am saying is that we leave the number as it is, except that the maximum of four for the spouse change to a maximum of six. It still leaves the total number of trips at 52 for the member and the spouse. You cannot use 53 as there are only 52 there.

Mr. Kerr: That is 46 you will have for yourself.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, unless somebody chooses not to bring his spouse six times. Then, of course, you have more for the member.

Mr. Hodson: Let the member decide how he uses the tickets. If he wants to use them to get his spouse down here while he stays home, that is all right.

Mr. Boudria: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear that.

Mr. Hodgson: I said I would be in favour of letting the member use 20 of the 52 tickets for his spouse if he wants to, but all he would get is 52 tickets.

Mr. Boudria: No, Mr. Chairman, I personally would not advocate that. One must not abuse the system. Those tickets are issued for a member to come to the Legislature to represent his constituents. I feel that is what they should be used for.

Just expanding on that a little bit, though, there are occasions when I would say it is certainly advisable to have one's spouse here. I think the number four as it now is, with the sessions lasting longer in recent years, is not quite sufficient. I think the number should be changed from four to six. If that is still not enough, perhaps at some time in the future we could review it.

Mr. Hodgson: I have no argument with that, but there is another part which you are leaving out that Mr. Newman wanted in here, that is, that the ticket be for the spouse or a member of the family.

Mr. Boudria: That is a different issue, Mr. Chairman. But we could perhaps say that the spouse or next-of-kin ticket, if you wish, be changed from four to six, and then we will have to define what next of kin is.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchinson prepared the report on this. Is it the wish of the committee that he address this?

Mr. Mitchinson: I just want to make the members aware that in this case, unlike some of the other services that are provided to the members, to change the spouse allowance from four to six would have to be done by statute. It is not like the

federal act where it is determined by internal administration. If we want to change the numbers here, it has to be by statute. It is not an administrative thing at all.

Mr. Chairman: It takes an act of the Legislature to change it then.

Mr. Mitchinson: That is right. It would require an amendment.

Mr. Hodgson: It cannot be done by regulation?

Mr. Mitchinson: No, it cannot. The number is in the act. The Board of Internal Economy discussed this at the last meeting and, on the understanding that there would probably be some amendments made to the Legislative Assembly Act, they instructed the staff to prepare a suggested amendment to cover these sorts of questions. It requires that formal move.

Mr. Chairman: Would it be agreeable to the committee then to hold off further debate on this, see what kind of draft they come back with for the Board of Internal Economy and then comment on that?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: We might make a recommendation to the Board of Internal Economy that it consider increasing the number of spousal or next-of-kin trips.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: At least that would leave them with our opinion. If Mr. Boudria wants to list six as an adequate number, I think that would give them some guidance for redrafting the legislation.

Mr. Mitchinson: The Board of Internal Economy did not discuss the number of trips at all.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: No. They will go into amendments to the legislation before it comes back to this committee again and we will then lose the opportunity that Mr. Boudria wants to discuss.

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared then to move we recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that they consider amending that legislation to change the number of spousal trips from four to six?

Mr. Boudria: Yes. That would be what I would have in mind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Boudria moves that the committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that it consider an amendment to the legislation to change the number of spousal trips from four to six and that the privilege extend the trips to the spouse or next of kin.

Mr. Boudria: We will leave it to the Board of Internal Economy to put into the legislation and to define what a next of kin is. I understand there is a formula which has been set for this by the federal House. They could look into those kinds of details. For instance, a member could bring his daughter or--

Mr. Kerr: Executive assistant.

Mr. Boudria: I would not suggest that constitutes a next of kin--at least not in all cases.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Is it the wish that it be in two parts? The first part of the motion is to recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the number of spousal tickets be amended from four to six.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The second part is that we also recommend that the Board of Internal Economy extend the spousal privileges to mean and include next of kin by their definition. .~

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Hodgson: The act refers to travel allowance for members. We were talking about direct flights. What about the extra costs in gasoline? Do we make the recommendation here?

Mr. Boudria: Do you mean to change the 17 cents a kilometre?

Mr. Hodgson: Yes.

Interjections.

Mr. O'Neil: I think it is an excellent idea, Mr. Chairman. I think a recommendation should come from this committee that the amount we were being paid per kilometre be increased from what it is now.

Mr. Samis: I think it should be mentioned that the increases are going to be regular from here on in, especially with the budget. Rather than have to debate it every six months or something, can we not work on a formula of some sort?

Mr. Chairman: Do you want ad valorem based on--

Mr. G. W. Taylor: It is the Board of Internal Economy that does that?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is. It might be appropriate to recommend to the Board of Internal Economy, through member services, that they consider the rates of remuneration paid for mileage, both north and south. Does anybody want to make that as a motion?

Mr. Hodgson moves that the committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the rates of remuneration paid for mileage be reviewed.

Motion agreed to.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order. If there is no new business before the committee and as we have cleared almost everything off the agenda now with the exception of the food services, which are to come back in two weeks, I recommend that, except by the call of the chair, we meet in two weeks' time.

Agreed to.

The committee adjourned at 5:23 p.m.



CAZON  
XC 23  
- M 27

FILE COPY - DO NOT REMOVE  
ROOM 451N

M-3  
Government  
Publications

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES  
HANSARD FRENCH TRANSLATION SERVICES

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

/Substitutions:

Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC) for Mr. Taylor  
Mancini, R. (Essex South L) for Mr. Ruston

/Also taking part:

Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)

Clerk: Richardson, A.

From the Ministry of Government Services:

Allen, F., Manager, Accommodation Analysis Unit  
Pencak, L., Assistant Deputy Minister  
Thatcher, J. C., Deputy Minister  
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister

From the Office of the Legislative Assembly:

Brannan, P., Editor of Debates, Hansard Reporting Service  
Perry, C., Manager, Members' Food and Beverage Services

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, June 18, 1981

The committee met at 4:01 p.m. in room No. 228.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES  
HANSARD FRENCH TRANSLATION SERVICES  
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I call the meeting to order. I draw the committee's attention to the agenda.

You will note the order in which the items appear. With committee's concurrence, of course, I would like suggest the following course of action: that we deal, in the first instance, with the short-term suggestions and recommendations contained in Mr. Perry's report of May 25, which we debated but did not take action on at our last meeting.

We could deal with those and then deal with item number one, the possible relocation of the members' facilities for which representatives from the Ministry of Government Services are here. Following that, we will go back to item two on the agenda, which deals with the second report that Mr. Perry has prepared and with the long-term suggestions, again, contained in the report of May 25. Do I have the consent of the committee to proceed on that basis?

Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McLean, did you have a motion on item number one, dealing with the short-term suggestions?

Mr. McLean: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McLean moves that the committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the members' lounge in the north wing be closed and the money allocated for that lounge be allocated to the cafeteria or to part of the press gallery.

The operative part of Mr. McLean's motion is that we recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the members' lounge in the north wing be closed.

Mr. Boudria: On a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, are we going to table this recommendation in the House?

Mr. Chairman: I understand the process from here would be to the Board of Internal Economy, would it not, Mr. Richardson?

Clerk of the Committee: Yes.

Mr. Mancini: This matter was given some discussion at a previous meeting. At that time, some of us felt maybe the members' lounge in the basement of the north wing was not being used a great deal. Therefore, we were running up an expense for something the members were not using, more or less.

I understand that, and I think I echoed some of those comments myself. At the same time, I do not think I am prepared to give up that facility unless it is replaced with a an alternative the members will be able to use. After watching things operate here for the past five or six years, a lot of promises are made about if we do this, in the future we could expect something else.

I am just not prepared from past experience to accept the closure of the members' lounge in the north wing unless I know clearly and have evidence before me that a further facility, which is more convenient and more conducive for the use of members, would be made available. If Mr. McLean has information like that, all of us should know. If not, then I think we should be very careful before we decide the lounge should be closed.

I, for one, would be eager to have the members' lounge closed, that room in the basement of the north wing, if I knew that another facility was going to be made available. However, not having that information in front of me, I do not think I could support Mr. McLean's motion, although I share his concerns.

Mr. Chairman: From your comments, I gather you are saying if we are going to give something up which now exists, you want to be certain there is a replacement, a locked-in replacement, to compound the resolution.

Mr. Mancini: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mancini said exactly what I wanted to say. I just think the motion is unacceptable in its present form because there is no assurance, no provision and no guarantee of an alternative facility or service. On that basis, we just cannot close one down without having the guarantee of another facility being provided.

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder if the motion could be reworded or changed so that it could incorporate what has been said by the last two members.

Mr. McLean: Really, the basis of making the motion was the fact that there was a \$42,000 loss on wages alone last year. I think it should be handled separately. In my estimation, I think we should take it one step at a time. Once we decide to close the lounge for lounge purposes, then we can come up with an alternative or what we feel it could be utilized for if need be.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. O'Neil, we are dealing with a motion at this point. Do you have a question on the motion?

Mr. O'Neil: If it is closed, do you feel there has to be one somewhere else for the members? In other words, you are not just saying, "Close it," without supplying something else. Are you saying you want it closed, and it is up to somebody else to decide whether or not we get it elsewhere?

Mr. McLean: I do not think there is enough use being made of the lounge to warrant a lounge in this building.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I missed the last meeting of the committee. My understanding was that there was some discussion--I am asking this as a matter of information first--that in place of the north lounge, the dining room would be opened evenings and some other times as a lounge when the dining room was not being used as a dining room. Was that discussed at this committee in conjunction with this?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Rotenberg, even as you are saying that, I am considering and then trying to read what we were discussing, further down in Mr. Perry's report.

I wonder if, with the agreement of the committee, we could perhaps ask Mr. Perry to speak specifically to his report in that area, which might serve to clarify the situation. Then we will at least know what we are dealing with.

Mr. Perry: My suggestion was that if the members' lounge is closed, particularly in the evenings, we would continue to keep the dining room open until half an hour after the House rises, clear off part of the dining room near the bar and make that a lounge area. Obviously, during the daytime this could not be done because we are open for breakfast service and we are open for lunch, but it could be left open in the afternoons, if the members required it, from 2:30 until 5 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: Does that address itself to the matter of night sittings as well, Mr. Perry?

Mr. Perry: Yes. We could keep part of the dining room open as a lounge in the evenings.

Mr. Mancini: What am I supposed to do with constituents who are here during the day and need a place to sit for half an hour and maybe talk in a sociable type of atmosphere? What am I to tell them?

Mr. Perry: Unfortunately, I think most members have decided that it is not a sociable atmosphere in the north wing anyway.

Mr. Mancini: It is a last resort, Mr. Perry.

Mr. Perry: Exactly. It is a last resort.

Mr. Mancini: That is right, and when it is needed as a last resort, it is used. I cannot see closing the lounge without having an alternative in its place.

Mr. Chairman: It is not really fair to ask Mr. Perry to speak to the politics of it.

Mr. Mancini: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. I know Mr. Perry is a staff person, but surely he sits here and hears these discussions. He has heard for the past two or three weeks that we were looking for an alternative to the present situation. Would that not be one of his responsibilities, when that discussion comes up, to look for an alternative?

We discussed, I believe in a previous meeting, that the press lounge could be used for an alternative, but that does not look as if it is going to materialize. I cannot understand why there are not other alternatives you are placing before us.

Mr. Perry: I have no jurisdiction over the building.

Mr. Chairman: In fairness to Mr. Perry, Mr. Mancini, if you look at his report of May 25, where he discusses the long-term suggestions, I think you will note that there are recommendations contained therein that he is going to address himself to specifically later in the meeting.

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps it would be in order to move an amendment to that resolution, by adding the following words: "and that work be commenced to relocate the lounge in the east area near the dining room." Our resolution would then be contingent upon us being able to acquire that space east of the dining room, in other words, to relocate whoever is in the area east of the dining room to the north wing, the barber's shop and all those other things that are there. If that cannot be done, then the resolution will be deemed to be redundant.

4:10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: I did not really follow that, but I gather you are asking Mr. McLean if he would be prepared to amend his motion.

Mr. Boudria: No, I am moving an amendment to his resolution.

Mr. Rotenberg: We have Mr. Perry. Shouldn't we continue the questions to Mr. Perry before we have other things.

Mr. Chairman: I thought we were, Mr. Rotenberg, and I thought that was what Mr. Boudria was going to do. We will hold that.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Perry, I am curious. You talked about the members' dining room, or parts of it, being available for lounge purposes. I gather you said you can have it open from 2:30 until 5 p.m. and then you have to clear it for dinner. Then you will have it open again, say, from 8:30 until 11. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Perry: That is what I was saying.

Mr. Rotenberg: I know at lunch time the dining room is pretty crowded. I have very seldom been there for dinner. Is it crowded at dinner time, or would it be possible, even through dinner, to have a small portion of the dining room as a lounge? Would that be possible?

Mr. Perry: On most evenings, yes.

Mr. Rotenberg: On evenings that the House is not sitting, normally Mondays or Wednesdays, would it be possible to have part of the dining room open as a lounge, say from 2:30 until 6:30, which is half an hour after the House closes down?

Mr. Perry: Most certainly, yes.

Mr. Rotenberg: What I suggest, Mr. Perry, just to summarize, is if we substituted the dining room for the north wing, we could have a lounge open on days the House sits at night from 2:30 through until 11, but at the dinner hour a smaller portion. Then on days when the House is not sitting in the evenings, part of the dining room could be open from 2:30 to 6:30 as a lounge. Would that be feasible?

Mr. Perry: Yes, it would.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Perry, the only thing I wonder about is we are looking at the cost of the lounge in the north wing. If you start opening up part of the dining room during hours when it is not open now, just how much of an actual saving would there be? You may consolidate as far as serving and keeping control, but are we actually going to save any money at all by doing that?

Mr. Perry: Yes, we will save the staff in the north wing because I already employ staff in the dining room, basically, during those hours.

Mr. O'Neil: Right now the dining room is not open during the hours you are talking about for this lounge, but you still have the staff there?

Mr. Perry: Yes, I do.

Mr. O'Neil: In other words, you would be making use of the staff which now do not have that much to do?

Mr. Perry: That is right.

Mr. Samis: We have talked about physical arrangements, but what capacity are we talking about if we adopt your proposal?

Mr. Perry: It depends on how many members wish to use the facility, obviously. I did a survey over the past two weeks of the present members' lounge. We counted the actual number of visits made, not people.

Mr. Samis: Your staff were meticulous in conducting that survey, too.

Mr. Perry: We averaged 129 visits per day. If somebody came for a coffee in the morning, at lunchtime and in the afternoon, that was three visits. The average sales were 65 cents per person per visit. The total sales were \$85 a day on average. In the evenings, the average sale was \$18 for a labour cost of \$66. If only this number of people come either into the dining room or the cafeteria, then I can certainly accommodate them.

Mr. Samis: But I would presume if you had a better location, which the dining room is, a more convenient location, possibly a more conducive environment, you would have more people. I would still like to know what sort of capacity you are thinking of or planning on.

Mr. Perry: On the offpeak hours we can use most of the dining room.

Mr. Samis: You would use most of the dining room?

Mr. Perry: I could, if necessary. We have the annex to the dining room and right up to the bar. It certainly holds more than the press lounge.

Mr. Samis: So your general concept is to make as much use of the dining room space as is needed?

Mr. Perry: Yes.

Mr. Mancini: What is going to happen to the employees presently in the north wing?

Mr. Perry: I have two retirements on the twenty-seventh of this month and, as of this moment, I have not made any attempt to replace them. I was waiting for a decision from the committee. If we were closing it, then I would not need to replace them.

Mr. Rotenberg: I do not know if I understand this correctly. We come into this meeting here. Mr. McLean makes his motion. Is Mr. McLean aware of these plans you have under way?

Mr. McLean: It is all in the minutes.

Mr. Mancini: Yes, but my recollection of those debates, Mr. McLean and Mr. Perry, was that it was discussed generally but the committee, from what I can recall, did not take any firm action to say yes, it was going to take steps to get rid of the lounge in the north wing. It was discussed; it was said that it was not conducive to attract people to go in there and that we wanted a place where we could make more use of.

Correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Chairman. Did we pass a motion, or did we give instruction to Mr. Perry in any way that we wanted to close that?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I draw your attention in the first instance, Mr. Mancini, back to Mr. Perry's report of May 25, 1981.

He prepared this report at the request of committee. One of the options he was asked to consider was the closure of that lounge, based on the financial aspects and the financial viability of it.

Mr. Mancini: That sheds a different light on it, Mr. Chairman, because if it says one of the options to be considered is closing the lounge, then surely the other option is to find something to take the place of the lounge we are closing. I do not know how we are going to be able to turn the dining room into a lounge when we have table and chairs there.

Mr. Perry: My long-term suggestion was, as Mr. Boudria has pointed out, that we perhaps could take over the facility presently occupied by the barber shop, the clerk's office and nurses' station, et cetera, and convert that into a member's lounge. However, as I pointed out, I do not control the space. I cannot make any decision on whether that space is even going to be made available. I can only make a suggestion about it.

Mr. Mancini: Thank you, Mr. Perry. I would be more than willing to support Mr. McLean's motion when we get strict assurance from whoever controls that space that that area just spoken about now by Mr. Perry is going to be made available for a members' lounge. Then we could pass Mr. McLean's motion without any problems at all.

Mr. Rotenberg: I have a further question. Mr. Perry, you indicated a few minutes ago you could staff the dining room as a lounge because you have staff available. I do not want to read anything into your remarks that was not there, but it seemed to me from what you were saying that you have people on staff and on payroll who, for some hours during the day, are doing nothing. Is that a correct interpretation of what you were saying?

Mr. Perry: They are doing other duties. However, certain members of the staff were here and were guaranteed a certain work week when I came to this establishment. I have had to keep them on that guarantee.

Mr. Rotenberg: In other words, they were guaranteed certain hours whether they work or not. Are there now staff members on that guarantee who are being paid that guarantee and who, for some part of that work day, are doing nothing?

Mr. Perry: That is correct because the bar is closed.

Mr. Rotenberg: I would like to speak after Mr. Perry is finished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Let me try to summarize where we seem to be at at the moment, as I was the one that suggested the procedure to begin with. Mr. Mancini is most anxious, as I gather are some other members, that there be some guarantee of an alternate form of accommodation and he wanted to know who might be able to give that guarantee.

As you know from the agenda, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) is here this afternoon with his staff to talk about an alternate use for the north wing. Also, ultimately under his ministry falls the use of areas of the building. I want to be fair, particularly in this committee of all committees, where I think everyone is very much involved in what is going on.

I would be prepared, if it is agreeable to the committee and agreeable to the minister, for him to make his presentation dealing with space requirements. You can ask your questions of him and then we will vote. We will have a discussion on the motion, needless to say, but perhaps that will also give us a broader spectrum of exactly what the situation is.

Mr. Watson: Do you want a motion to stand this one down?

Mr. Chairman: I think we can get by, thank you, Mr. Watson. Mr. Minister, you get to sit in the hot seat at the end. Mr. Richardson is just going to wire it for electrical current.

4:20 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I will introduce my staff here. They are my deputy, John Thatcher; Lon Pencak, assistant deputy minister in charge of accommodation; and Fred Allen who will make the slide presentation a little later.

We made a presentation about a year ago and then we had our discussion in the Legislature about our proposals. We have modified them a bit and we hope, because the committee is new, we could show them again and get your reaction on what we are proposing, or what might be down the road for us in Government Services about giving more accommodation to the members and possible changes for people who are presently occupying the building.

If we could, Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Allen to go ahead with the presentation. We will answer any questions you might have at the end.

Mr. Allen: Before I start, I must apologize because I will be speaking with my back towards you. If I am not speaking loud enough, please say so.

Mr. Samis: Could the screen be tilted a little more evenly for the rest of this on this side?

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the people in the audience would like to take chairs up here so they can see that.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. If there is anyone who is interested in seeing the presentation, please feel free to take chairs to the side of the room or up here behind us.

Mr. Allen: When we are looking at the entire question relative to the Legislative Building expansion, we really have to consider a number of facts that will affect whatever sort of proposals and considerations of future expansion we may have. Initially, we are looking at the likelihood of a redistribution review to occur some time in the next two years as a result of the recent census. Traditionally, redistribution has occurred within a couple of years of past censuses; therefore, we can fully expect something will be happening in the very near future.

Representation by population will certainly continue as a dominant factor, especially in southern Ontario. We can expect approximately 94.4 per cent of our population to be located in the southern Ontario Golden Horseshoe area at the present time. In terms of rural and northern seats, previous recommendations have been to retain those seats. We assume that the status quo will be retained as well in terms of numbers. The 1976 average population per electoral district was 66,000. That statistic will become important in just a minute.

Mr. O'Neil: You are talking about average population, not the number of voters, but the actual population.

Mr. Allen: That is the actual population. That will be clear in the next slide.

Let us just look at the top portion and I think that will answer your concern. If we look at population projected according to statistics that have been provided by Treasury and Economics to the year 2001, we are looking at a fairly substantial increase in population from the present figures we are looking at now. If we translate that, using that average statistic for electoral district, we can come up with a fairly good representation of the anticipated numbers of additional members who could possibly be added to the House. If we look at our present membership of 125, under a review we can possibly expect an additional 10 members, if we use the projections that we have been given. We can carry this to 2001 when we will be looking at approximately 153 members.

This fits closely with the projections that were developed under the Morrow report, and we feel that it is a very good fit. We can translate that into some space concerns. If we accept expansion, we are really going to have an impact on two areas. The first is the legislative chambers, where we would be expecting an additional 10 to 13 members by 1983.

Mr. Kerr: Why would you say that?

Mr. Allen: Traditionally, as I mentioned previously, after a census, there is a review of distribution. We expect by about 1983 that there would be a recommendation for increasing the number of members in the House. We anticipate, based on the example previously given, that it would be somewhere in the range of 10 to 13 members.

Mr. Kerr: Would we have a series of by-elections?

Mr. Allen: No. We are suggesting that a recommendation would be made to expand the House by 10 or 13 members. That would not be reflected until the following election, of course.

The second major area of impact would be on members' offices, legislative activities and that type of thing. I would like to go to another slide and we can come back to this.

Here we have an example that shows us essentially how we can expand the House to accommodate 158 members. The areas in red indicate the additional seats we could add to the present seating arrangement. This can be accomplished fairly easily, though there would be far more work involved than meets the eye. I do not want to go into it in detail. Essentially, what it involves is moving the existing seating back approximately six to eight inches in each row to provide enough space to create the additional seating capacity.

At the same time, we could expand additional seats up the aisle on both sides. This would add approximately 26 seats to the 158 shown here. However, you would run into potential problems from interference with the Clerk's table, official ceremonies and this type of thing. This slide shows that it is feasible to expand the existing chamber.

Going back to the second area where any sort of growth will have an impact, the Morrow report suggested that each member should be given 500 square feet. We have called this more or less the 500 square foot standard per member. The present building really cannot accommodate the added growth, which we have indicated is quite feasible. It is very inflexible to any sort of change and costly. This is especially true in terms of legislative support areas. There is also the continued potential for inequalities relative to this 500 square foot standard. In the previous House, there were a number of inequalities in terms of members' offices locations being close to various party leaders, et cetera.

4:30 p.m.

Just to give you an estimate, here is a slide that is strictly a Ministry of Government Services estimate as to the potential requirements required on an immediate basis. The title of this slide is the Current Estimated Deficit in Requirements for Major Problem Areas. We have centred in on the problem areas. I am sure there are a number of items that each one in this room could challenge, but let's concentrate on these.

With the number of committees we have, there are a number of shortfalls in the availability of space for meetings and this type of thing. We have estimated we could add another 2,000 square feet immediately. The NDP caucus room has been taken over on the interim by legislative library activities. This, in turn, will be taken over by the new gym facility for the members.

Mr. Rotenberg: What gym facilities?

Mr. Allen: I think that is a subsequent agenda item.

Mr. Mancini: Tell us what is going on here. It is the first we have heard of it. We want to know more about the gym facilities. This is new stuff.

Mr. Allen: Can we leave that and come back to it? There is a bit of a presentation on that. I didn't know I let the cat out of the bag here.

Mr. Mancini: That's what we want.

Mr. Allen: There is a substantial amount of space in the Whitney Block, approximately 6,400 square feet, that is occupied by existing committees and this type of thing. They are really part of the legislative building. They should really be here. Unfortunately, with the amount of space that is available, they have been occupying that space for a number of years.

The same could be considered for the Legislative Assembly support staff. They have now been moved to the old Hydro building on University Avenue, approximately 3,600 square feet. Certain legislative library functions should really be included in the overall building. We are looking at the newspaper clipping services that are now on a lease at 700 Bay Street and a very crowded facility that is currently at 880 Bay Street--that is the checklist and catalogue services. Their requirement is probably double the space they are in now. We have the technical services people who are currently using the former NDP caucus room.

The important thing is the order of magnitude that is shown here. In terms of immediate requirement, we are looking at about 19,600 usable square feet. I would like to point out one thing. There is a small note at the top. We are saying, "Incremental only, status quo for legislative building."

I point this out because the 19,000 square-foot estimate that we have given here is really just an MGS estimate. It is assuming that all these activities would be in addition to the activities that are currently in the legislative building. We know there are problems with some of the spaces in the building and we are looking at incremental requirements. This becomes important when we consider the next slide as well.

Mr. Rotenberg: Are there copies of these slides so we can have this in printed form to ask questions later?

Mr. Allen: I do have a handout that I prepared and will hand out at the end.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Allen, can I interrupt? Time is of the essence, unfortunately, today. I do not want to curtail your presentation, but could you move to the section dealing specifically with the matter that is before committee, which is the disposition of the present north lounge area and things that are associated with it.

Mr. O'Neil: Maybe we could move a little faster. I think we can comprehend what you are saying all right.

Mr. Allen: Let's go right to the summary. What we are looking at in terms of immediate requirements and future requirements--again, I stress the incremental aspect--is something around the neighbourhood of 43,000 square feet. The question really becomes, how do we satisfy that requirement?

There are a number of questions that have been raised previously. One of the options was to consider an additional floor to the north wing. Obviously, if we can only supply 13,600 square feet of usable space at a cost of \$12 million, it really is far too expensive to consider. I would like to point out just a couple of things because they come up in other slides.

One of the bases for comparison of the various alternatives we are presenting is the cost of the net space. That is really achieved by looking at the net space that has increased as a result of the project divided into the total cost, and we come up with a cost of the net space.

One alternative that has been considered previously, which we would reiterate again, is that there is the possibility of moving and satisfying the legislative expansion requirements in the Whitney Block. The building is physically connected. We would be able to satisfy far more than 20-year requirements, and there is already about 6,400 square feet in the Whitney Block.

We would have to do this by relocating the Ministry of Natural Resources. The ministry occupies a considerable amount of space in locations other than the Whitney Block. However, what we are looking at is a building that would be constructed in the east of Bay area. This would allow us then, in turn, to move the legislative functions over to the Whitney Block and satisfy the long-term requirements.

Mr. Rotenberg: Excuse me, you mentioned the fact that there is space in the Whitney Block. Is that only if Natural Resources moves out, or is space in the Whitney Block now available?

Mr. Allen: It is space in the Whitney Block if Natural Resources moves out. We are looking at a fairly substantial building. I would like to point out that if we are dealing with any proposal in this particular aspect, we are looking at a substantial cost for alterations associated with the Whitney Block and subsequent alterations for space that would be vacated in the legislative building.

Again, the cost of this particular project is approximately \$26 million. I point out again that is 1981-82 dollars. These are not inflated dollars. These are at present value. The net cost for the space that is produced is \$88. This is very economical in terms of present construction costs, and we feel that this is worthy of consideration.

I would just like to point out, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of very highly positive benefits associated with this. I think the key thing that concerns the Ministry of Government Services is that we have about 10 major head office problems that would be resolved by freeing up space in the Whitney Block and, hence, being able to use some of that space to meet these needs as well as, I emphasize, meeting the legislative functions, and there would be all kinds of flexibility that would satisfy us for far more than 20 years.

The third option is to demolish the north wing in one fell swoop. This would provide more than adequate space. It is a total maximum site development. We are looking at a total present value cost of about \$30 million. I would like to emphasize on this point that it would involve an interim lease situation for the activities that are currently in the north wing.

These would have to be relocated, more than likely in the Whitney Block, since it is so close at hand. We would also have to relocate a similar amount of space--approximately 58,000 usable square feet or 70,000 rentable, as the case may be--to an alternative lease location; hence the substantial interim lease cost. The cost of the space at \$205 a usable square foot for the net space increase is considered within the ball park of acceptability, but on the high side.

4:40 p.m.

I would like to point out as well that all members' offices and activities would be brought to standard and be accommodated within the new wing. The Lieutenant Governor's suite would be on the top floor of the addition. There might be a concern relative to the space that would be vacated in the Legislative Building but that would be handled subsequently.

Option four which has been developed recently really is a two-phase replacement for the north wing. It is really option three divided into two phases with construction spread out over approximately eight to 10 years. We are looking at a slightly reduced amount of space but a considerable present value difference in the cost of the project. When you net out the lease savings of approximately \$6.1 million, you are looking at a total net project cost of about \$22.6 million or a net cost for the space gained of about \$157 per usable square foot.

This is highly recommendable from our point of view. It solves the existing problems and it means that we do not have to relocate the members and other activities on an interim basis. It allows us to accrue this particular net saving. Again, it is a maximum site development which allows us to build and, at the same time, preserve the architectural essence of the main legislative building and it also includes a special Lieutenant Governor's suite on the top floor. There is the minor problem of having to relocate interim parking, but that could be arranged in the Macdonald Block basement facilities.

Mr. O'Neil: That two-phase development you are talking about would be in the same position where the north wing is now then?

Mr. Allen: Yes.

Mr. O'Neil: How would it be in two phases, or are you going to show us how?

Mr. Allen: I do have some slides we are going to present if I could just take a brief second to switch over projectors here.

Mr. Rotenberg: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I know we have invited Government Services and I know there was some misunderstanding. I see on the agenda for today's meeting we are to talk about the use of the north wing and the possible members' facilities within the building. I do not think we asked, in my understanding, for a presentation on the long-term use of other buildings or other building projects.

Equally important, with respect, I do not think it is in any way within the competence of this committee to discuss anything about additions or a new building facility. It is certainly beyond our competence. We are a members' services committee and we are here to discuss the existing members' services and possible replacement.

This is all very interesting and maybe it is a rehearsal for a cabinet presentation but, with respect, I think we should discuss the business over which this committee has jurisdiction and try to stick with that if we can.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I think it certainly is within the mandate of this committee to look at this proposal and table whatever we decide in the House and then, of course, it could be discussed in the House. What is this committee for if it is not to discuss the services and space that are allocated to members of this Legislature? The House may decide later what it wants, but certainly we would not want that presentation made in the House. This is obviously the right forum for it and I think it is in our best interests to look at it. Perhaps the pace of it could be accelerated somewhat, though, because we do have other things on the agenda. I think it is very important and we should look at it.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I thought, Mr. Chairman, we were looking at this as well as the possibility of a recreational area in the north wing. Maybe I was wrong in assuming this, but I thought this was what it was all about.

To answer Mr. Rotenberg's question, we did bring this in and the former chairman and committee were very interested. I think all members should be interested in having the proper accommodation.

Mr. Rotenberg: It is far beyond the scope of this committee.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We are all a little better off now because of some of the changes that have been made lately in moving some out of this building and into the Hydro building, but this time a year ago there was not this same feeling of having enough space and maybe not worrying about the future. We were really worrying about that, both at this committee level and when we brought our estimates into the House.

We have modified our proposal of a year ago, and that last slide that Mr. Allen had on showed that. It is nice for us to know that you agree, disagree or have some suggestions for us. We do not have all the answers over in Government Services and we want to know if we do go with this whether you are basically in favour of it or are we away out in left field.

Mr. Hodgson: You mentioned about recreational facilities in the north wing. Did the former committee request that you make a presentation and do a study on recreational facilities in the north wing?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That has been done for some time; it was done by a former minister. During my estimates last year four or five members in the House spoke on having some sort of a recreational facility in the building; they did not say where.

Mr. Hodgson: I know we have three or four joggers. They jog right here and then have a shower. I do not know what more recreational facilities--

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Hodgson, I think in fairness, the matter of the alternative use was drawn to this committee's attention and the committee as a whole expressed interest in hearing the proposal that Mr. Wiseman had to make on behalf of the ministry with regard to that specific use. I think, Mr. Wiseman, the committee finds itself in the middle of a specific issue at the moment that it is trying to come to grips with, that being the disposition of the north wing lounge or the continued use or whatever may be appropriate somewhere in between. That is foremost in everyone's mind just at the moment.

While your presentation is most appropriate and we are certainly interested in it, I think I can ask, on behalf of everyone, if we could perhaps do that at another time in greater detail when we are not perhaps as pressed as we are with an issue today. If we could deal specifically, at least for the time being, with the matter of your proposition on the lounge, it might satisfy everyone.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, I do not really agree with you on that. Since Mr. Wiseman is here with his deputy and staff, and as long as it does not drag out too long, I, as a member, would like to see what their long-term plans are. It does sort of work in with what we are doing and, as long as we can hurry it up a little bit, maybe we could cover the other items after he has finished.

Mr. Chairman: I am here merely to facilitate the business before the committee. Would 10 minutes do?

Mr. O'Neil: Why do we not go ahead and get it over with?

Mr. Samis: It will be half an hour then before we can get to the question of the lounge.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed.

Mr. Samis: I agree with Mr. Rotenberg. We came here to talk of the question of the lounge and it will be five o'clock if we ever get to it.

Mr. Chairman: All right, we will do it formally then. I will entertain a motion that Mr. Allen proceed with his presentation as he has been.

Mr. Boudria moved that Mr. Allen proceed with his presentation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Pencak: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the redevelopment of the north wing. What you can see on here is an outline of the existing building, this being the north wing. This portion here is, of course, the north wing and we will be addressing that.

4:50 p.m.

This proposal can be read in two alternatives that we have presented before, either the complete rebuilding of the north wing in one phase or in two phases. The end result basically would be the same and we would end up with a new structure over here facing Queen's Park north of here and having this area serving as an atrium, landscaped and preserving the facade of the main legislative building, as well as offering the opportunity for the new structure to face the atrium or court.

Mr. O'Neil: It is not quite clear. Point out where the old building is and the main building again.

Mr. Pencak: This is the outline of the main building.

Mr. O'Neil: And you are going to fill in that?

Mr. Pencak: Fill in that portion, with Wellesley being up here. We would leave this open and put the glass roof on top, if you like. It will become a little more apparent.

As you can see, at present this is the existing situation. Doing it in two phases, we would construct this part and this part first, while this part would be in use. By the way, this portion here is at the lower level, in the basement.

After completing these two parts we would move the members and whatever activities there are in the present north wing into the new part and rebuild this as a second phase. Going floor by floor, on the second lower floor we would provide a parking area and some mechanical areas to serve the building. On the floor above that there would be another floor of parking, plus additional service-type areas, mechanical equipment and so on.

Mr. O'Neil: You are talking about two floors below ground?

Mr. Pencak: Two floors below ground. On the first floor we would have such activities as library and meeting rooms. Over here there would be a part going for the garage and this over here could be used for possibly a kitchen or what we have at present in the main building, a dining lounge.

On the main floor, which would coincide with the existing main floor of the legislative building, as I mentioned before, we have this court, an atrium type of facility which would be open for several floors to the sky, then being glazed in on top. These blue areas, as you can see, would be meeting rooms, conference rooms, committee rooms. The areas that you can see over here in purple are members' offices meeting the 500-square foot requirement.

On the floor above that would be more or less more of the same. The green, by the way, indicates circulation--corridors and so on. There will be more members' offices on the perimeter of the building, with the central core being used again for committee rooms and necessary functions.

There will be more of the same on the third floor but, as you can see, it is getting narrower and narrower. There is an effective step back from the north, from Queen's Park, of the new building. On the fourth floor again there will be more offices and a further step back again.

Mr. Boudria: Would the new building be linked to the old building under such a plan, or would we have to do what we do now, in other words, come back from the fourth floor to the third floor and cross over and go up if we have to change floors? Is it linked at every floor level?

Mr. Pencak: It is linked at every floor level through these passages, as you can see. This is the very top, of course, where you have only one link. It is linked on every floor; it is continuous. For all intents and purposes you would feel like you were in the same building. You have right around circulation.

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder if I could also ask, because there are members of different parties spread over different floors and different parts of the building, approximately how many offices are you talking about on each of those floors? In other words, can you group the parties together on one floor?

Mr. Pencak: You have that flexibility. We are talking here in terms of maximum membership, as Fred presented before, of 155.

Mr. O'Neil: How many per floor would you be talking about?

Mr. Pencak: As you can see, it varies. Of course, I must say that these are very preliminary sketches. We do have the flexibility of shifting it around, but we have not counted just how many it works out to because, as I said, it is extremely preliminary.

Mr. O'Neil: That is one complaint I would have. In our party, we have people on different floors and in different parts of the building. If there was some way we could get them together, it would be better for a lot of reasons.

Mr. Pencak: As you realize, of course, this is a long-term plan and, with all due respect, as time goes on, parties shift as far as the numbers are concerned. You have to use perhaps some vertical division as opposed to having the ability of always having one party on one floor.

Mr. O'Neil: Right. I understand.

Mr. Pencak: That, if you can see it, gentlemen, is basically a cross-section indicating the relative position of the floors and the buildings. This is Wellesley over here and, as you can see, the building is stepped back. These are members' offices. These are central auxiliary facilities, boardrooms, committee rooms and such, and then more members' offices.

This is the space between the two buildings. This is the main building. What we would try to do, of course, is preserve the architecture of the main building--in fact, highlight it--create a court in here for various functions and, again, have the connection on every floor between the two buildings.

The floors' juxtaposition on the new building is somewhat different from the levels of the floors of the existing building simply because of its ceiling height, and we have indicated that some ramping may be necessary between the floors. That is that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Any questions on the presentation?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Do you want us to present the other presentation now, Mr. Chairman, so we won't hold you up?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Mr. Wiseman.

Mr. O'Neil: Which presentation is this?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: This is the fitness area, using the room--

Mr. Chairman: Relatively to the north, the members' lounge area.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Yes. The basement in the north that was the NDP caucus room.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I think that is the one everybody is keen to hear about at the moment.

Mr. Pencak: Mr. Chairman, again, this background indicates the Legislative Building; this is the north wing and this is the particular location of what we call the exercise room. Currently it is the members' lounge.

Mr. Rotenberg: Why do we not just call it the members' lounge? Nobody has talked about an exercise room yet.

Mr. Pencak: Members' lounge then. The members' lounge extends all the way to the core. As to what we propose, the yellow would be a physical exercise room; the red indicates female washrooms, change rooms and showers; and the blue area indicates male washrooms, change rooms and shower.

Mr. Rotenberg: Will that pass the Human Rights Code?

Mr. Chairman: Carry on, please.

Mr. Pencak: We have looked into that, and for the proportion of women to men, this does meet the various codes. To get into a little further detail of the exercise room itself, we have shown the equipment layout--again, this is the women's washroom, mens' washroom and change rooms. This is the exercise room itself. Basically, we are proposing to locate various pieces of equipment around mats, the exercise machine and a full-size mirror along this wall. That is it in a nutshell, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want to speak to the cost, Mr. Wiseman?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Pencak will have to correct me if I am wrong in this. About four years ago, the cost was around \$60,000 to complete.

Mr. Pencak: If I may correct my minister, \$60,000 is actually today's cost.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: It is \$60,000 today.

Mr. Chairman: It is a lot better than it was four years ago. Are there questions to the minister on the presentation relating to the north wing?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, you asked in a letter to me if there was any other space in the building to relocate the lounge.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

5 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: There really isn't unless we moved someone else out. As you know, when we try that, a hue and cry always goes up. I was just thinking, in most of these recreational areas which I have visited, alongside the recreational facility they usually have some sort of a lounge because usually after you exercise for a period of time you want something, whether it is something hard or just coke, but you are in need of something.

Mr. Boudria: I have no difficulty with the members' lounge in the north wing. It is probably a good idea, although I had never heard of it before. But I am still not happy with the business--and this sort of links up with the two discussions we had--of closing down the lounge and not relocating it.

I am just wondering if it is not possible to relocate people who are in the east area to the Whitney Block perhaps or to some other place throughout the building, and relocate the members' lounge in the east area, as I had in my earlier proposed resolution. That is where the barber shop, the pages and so on are located.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have an answer to that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No. My suggestion would have been to leave the lounge where it was and keep it the same size. I believe all we are dealing with in this yellow part is where the legislative library is at the present time.

Interjection: That is the NDP caucus room.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: But the lounge area that we know today would remain the same size, I believe.

Mr. Samis: In other words, you are not promising to keep the lounge where it is then.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Yes, keeping the lounge where it is and having this where the caucus room was.

Mr. Samis: If you spent that amount of money on that, would you upgrade the lounge in terms of decor, et cetera?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We had asked the Speaker a while ago, because that comes under the Speaker, if he would like us during the recess this summer to recarpet that area because it does look like the devil. At that time, I understood that you were discussion maybe relocating the lounge, so we held off on that. The Speaker had given me an indication, prior to that, that he would like us to go ahead and re-rug that.

Mr. O'Neil: Were your staff aware that we were thinking about moving the lounge out of there?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We were not at first, but we were afterwards. That is why we held off thinking about spending anything on it till we knew what your plans were.

Mr. O'Neil: There has also been talk about enlarging kitchen facilities so that things would work a little better in the dining room. I wondered whether there has been any consideration along that line for an enlargement of the dining room or any relocation of the dining room.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We have not had any discussions on that. We have had a request--I do not know whether your committee has had it yet--by some of the ladies in this building for a ladies' hairdressing shop. We have not been able to locate room for one of those as yet.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, one of the things we have to study is, if there is going to be this exercise room, where it is to be located, whether there is going to be a future enlargement of the kitchen facilities, whether that lounge might be located either in the dining room and whether there should be relocation of the barber shop and the other facilities.

Mr. Chairman: That goes back to the long-term proposals made in Mr. Perry's report to the House.

Mr. Hodgson, would you take the chair, please?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: It is down the road a way, the proposal we had there. But you will notice it did contain a proposal to have a dining room on the ground floor set up in the north wing in the future.

Mr. O'Neil: I have another question on that too. I realize it is a long-range plan which you are talking about. Because of the complaints we get about the dining room about its size, have you any ideas what the square footage would be on that dining room which would be planned for the north wing?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Pencak could probably give us a rough idea. On that slide that you had, did you have any idea how many square feet?

Mr. Pencak: Not offhand, I am sorry.

Mr. Samis: If we were to keep the lounge where it is and you were to proceed with your plans for the exercise room, wherever it is going to be, what time period will be needed to equip it that way? How long would that take?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Not very long. I will let Lon answer that.

Mr. Pencak: About six months

Mr. Allen: I had expected that form of request, and we said we could do it by next fall before the House meets.

Mr. Samis: If the request went through when--right away?

Mr. Allen: Within four weeks.

Mr. Rotenberg: If you leave the lounge where it is, where is the exercise room going to be, where the committee room is--

Mr. Kerr: Where it is shown.

Mr. Samis: Our old caucus room.

Mr. Kerr: The lounge or the exercise room and all its facilities are found, as you say, Mr. Minister, to stir a lot interest in food and drink--the revival of.

Mr. Samis: Especially if it was upgraded as well.

Mr. O'Neil: The only problem you have is the expense of running that lounge when you have to have additional stewards who are away from the kitchen area. You are still talking about a cost of--how much was the cost?--some \$40,000. You are going to have to put people there when you could be using in the dining room those who are there anyway and are perhaps not as busy as they should be.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Rotenberg, I think, is next.

Mr. Rotenberg: In view of the question to the minister, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could say something?

Mr. Samis: I want to ask one question about the unfolding scheme. If we were to vote to close down the lounge where it is and tentatively move into the dining room and the dining room could be expanded or something, what do you envisage that space--the lounge and the old NDP caucus room--being used for? You must have a grand scheme.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: At the present time, that comes under the Speaker. If the Speaker were to return that back to us, I am sure we could find some use for it.

Mr. Samis: You do not have that jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That is not under our jurisdiction.

Mr. Samis: I am still not clear about Mr. Boudria's question. If we made a decision to move the barber and the pages out, is it totally impossible to find alternate space for them?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Where would we put them?

Mr. Samis: That is what I am asking you. Is it totally impossible, at the present time, to find them alternate accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: You know how difficult it was to try and find rooms with outside windows for the members. We have done that and, by doing that, we have moved Joe Miggiani and some of the library staff and the whole bit to accommodate them.

Mr. Samis: But you did accommodate them.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We have to put someone else out to put in the nurse, the pages and the barber, if we need the barber shop, and a lot seem to use the barber shop there.

Mr. Samis: But the barber shop, obviously, does not have to be there. It could be somewhere else.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We could find some place else, but we have no space.

Mr. Samis: Then the question would be finding another place and the same with the pages.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We have no available space in the building, at the present time, without putting someone out. In fact, I do not have sessional offices for some of the ministers who are a long way away from this complex.

Mr. McLean: Would you have to close the lounge, or would it be convenient to have it closed, while you were doing the remodelling for the recreational area or whatever you want to call it?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Pencak tells me it would not be necessary, but it would be more convenient and probably the work would go along a little faster.

Mr. Samis: That sounds like a political matter.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I would not see that it would have to be closed.

Mr. Samis: Mackenzie King would be proud of you.

Mr. McLean: It seems logical to me. Close it and move it up to where the cafeteria is and extend your hours, when we have people there who are doing nothing. It makes common sense to me. Then once the remodelling took place and it looked feasible, that would be the place to put it back in again.

Mr. Samis: Have you approached the new Speaker to see if he will continue the stated intentions of the previous Speaker in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No. The only thing I have done is talk to the Speaker about some of the carpeting that comes under his jurisdiction, which I thought should be repaired during the summer. Many of you have told me about all this tape on certain rugs where there is as much tape as there is rug.

Mr. Samis: It goes beyond carpeting in the summer.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, this is a suggestion as a possibly chronology of how things should be done. Why not decide today that we are going to close the north wing lounge because Mr. Perry has to know that and very soon. We may be a few days in this session without the benefit of a lounge of some sort if the House sits longer than June 27--whenever his employees are going to be resigning in any case. Maybe we could decide right away to keep it open until June 27.

5:10 p.m.

We could also decide whether we want to have this gym and have it open for the fall. We may decide that at the same time we want this gym built we want to get the barbershop and whoever is in the east area moved to the north wing where the lounge used to be. Then, of course, we would reopen the lounge in time for the fall in the eastern part of the building where the barbershop used to be.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, we started out this discussion several meetings ago because everyone seemed to be a little upset about the money being expended on lounge situations. A number of members of this committee, myself included, felt that a lot of money was being wasted and we were not getting the value for the dollars spent on the subsidies in the various eating areas. This has expanded from trying to save money to all kinds of grandiose schemes, from rebuilding the north wing to exercise rooms and God knows what else. Let us get back to where we started.

We started out to have reasonable facilities for the members at a reasonable cost and reasonable return for the public dollars we are investing, to give the members reasonable accommodation, both as offices and lounge space.

I do not think there is any question in anybody's mind that the north wing lounge is not used anywhere near the capacity it could be. It is costing us \$40,000-odd to have the lounge there. There is a question in my mind, and there should be a question in everyone's mind, that no matter where in this building we put the lounge, will it really be used?

What I suggest--it picks up from Mr. McLean's motion--is that we proceed on the following simple basis. That we close the north wing at the end of this session, which will be one or two weeks depending on how long we talk, that we move the lounge facilities, as Mr. Perry outlined, into the present existing dining room, that there will be lounge facilities at all times, other than meal times when the lounge is not closed and there will even be lounge facilities through the dinner hour if there is enough space, without expanding into the barber shop, without the nurses, without the pages, without anything else.

Just do that one thing--have the lounge facilities in the dining room because their employees, who are sitting on their duffs doing nothing, could be managing the lounge because of other agreements.

We will try that, if it seems worth having a members' lounge in a location that is convenient with a conducive atmosphere, because certainly the dining room is a hell of a lot nicer than the north lounge. If we find that people are using it, if we find there is need for more facilities, that is the time to talk about moving the barber shop, moving something else out and putting another lounge there.

I, for one, am not prepared to spend--when we started this it was trying to save some wasted public dollars--public dollars building other facilities in this building when it has not been demonstrated that those facilities are required by members. I suggest we close the lounge and have the dining room become a dining room and lounge at the same time. There will be ample space for everybody and if there is a demonstrated need, we go further. I am not prepared, instead of saving money, to spend more money.

Mr. O'Neil: I would have to agree with your reasoning--part of it anyway--to see how it works. Mr. Mancini mentioned another thing, that if you are going to bring people in, would they be sitting at just the chairs and tables or would there be part of that dining room for couches and so on? I think we should know some of the ideas on that.

I do not really agree with Mr. Rotenberg. I think Mr. Wiseman has brought his people here today to give us a long-range plan on future requirements in the way of additional members and I appreciate that explanation. I do not think we should criticize them for that.

Mr. Rotenberg: I am not criticizing them. It was the right presentation at the wrong time. It was not on today's agenda as I understood it.

Mr. Boudria: It was. Did you read the agenda?

Mr. Kerr: Has there been any analysis or questionnaire or inquiry as to the reaction of the members to a gymnasium? It seems to me I signed something in the last 12 months or so asking whether or not we favoured something like this.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I do not think so. Just from talking to members individually, a lot of them have asked about it. It goes back to our estimates last year, and I believe some of those members have been asking for it over a period of years. There seem to be more and more of our members who are exercising or want to have some sort of an exercise gym here. Many of them are going away from this building and belong to clubs.

Mr. Kerr: It would be interesting to know how many of the members would want a gym and how many would use it during a reasonable period of time while the House is in session or otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Could it be a suggestion that the members' services committee do that, or would you like us to do that?

Mr. Kerr: It does not make any difference.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: It might enable the members of this committee to see whether it is warranted or not.

The Vice-Chairman: Just as a suggestion, Mr. Minister, we could have each caucus poll its members to find out how many are in favour of this recreation area in the north wing. I think it would be better than either you or the members' services committee doing it, if each caucus would take the responsibility of polling its own members.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of information, the former members' services committee did conduct a study and those results were available and were discussed by the former committee.

Mr. Kerr: How was that conducted?

Mr. Watson: It was done by the members' services committee. I believe Mr. Arnott was the clerk at that time and he summarized the results for us.

Mr. Mancini: Speaking to the matter of closing the lounge in the north wing and using the dining room as a temporary setup to see if it could be used or not, I just do not think that we should move to close the lounge until we have a permanent replacement. All of us know why the room is not being used. It is in a poor location, it is not very pleasant to sit there and look at those white walls and there is very little privacy. If one wanted to take some guests down there, he could not conduct a conversation in any kind of privacy at all. I think for those reasons the area has not been used in the last few years as much as it could have been.

Just by moving that lounge into the dining room with nothing but tables and chairs--there will not be any sofas or couches--there is no way Mr. Perry could transform that dining room into a lounge. He cannot move out those tables and chairs and put some couches there for people to sit in a different kind of atmosphere. I think it would be good for members to have a room where they can feel comfortable and go in and chat and maybe talk even with members of other parties.

I realize that maybe we are not getting the use out of the room we have and in that way it is wasteful, but to say that we are going to set it up in the dining room and then use that as a guide, really is not going to provide any guide at all. I, for one, am not going to go down there. I am not going to sit around a dining room table and try to pretend it is a lounge.

I would be willing to have the present lounge closed as soon as possible. We will be out of here at least by August 1. I would be willing to have that thing closed as soon as we leave this place as long as we have the assurances that a permanent lounge will be made accessible for members and their guests. I have many guests who come here from out of town. I do not have the luxury of

living in Toronto so that if I felt like going home I could jump in my car and in 15 minutes be home and not need a lounge. I could use other facilities, I guess. If I were a parliamentary assistant, I would have a nice big office and I would entertain my municipal officials there in the privacy of that office, but there are a lot of members who just do not have those facilities and they are from out of town.

5:20 p.m.

I do not know what the objection is. I could be corrected, but I do not think there is a legislature in Canada that does not have a members' lounge where people can sit and relax. After the kind of session we have had this spring, I think the members need a place to go and relax a little bit.

Mr. Rotenberg: Do you visualize the members' lounge as being for members only with their guests, but people without members cannot go in?

The Vice-Chairman: Just a minute. Mr. O'Neil is on before you, Mr. Rotenberg.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, this might be a case of where, if we close the lounge in the north wing, temporarily move it into the dining room and maybe do what Mr. Mancini is talking about, we could look at the barber shop and that immediate area for a small lounge adjacent to the dining room where the present staff would be able to look after it without having these additional costs for someplace away from the main dining room and away from the staff.

Mr. Mancini: I would be willing to support the motion provided that it is explicit that we take steps to seek a permanent location for the lounge.

Mr. Rotenberg: I did not ask that question facetiously. The point is if you are going to have a lounge that is restricted to members only and their guests, as the north wing is not because a lot of staff people use it, then you need a much smaller space than if you are going to have a lounge that is really open to the public. If you visualize the lounge for members only, then I think you could provide it.

Mr. Mancini: It would seem to me that people walk in off the street to use that lounge, and usually they learn about the lounge through somebody who is associated with these buildings, be they staff people or friends of staff people or friends of members. That is how they find out about the lounge.

Mr. Rotenberg: Could we say close the north wing, temporarily use the dining room as a lounge as Mr. Perry has outlined, and we, as a committee, commit ourselves to finding some permanent space--possibly the barber shop will be big enough with a little bit of extra space--for a permanent lounge attached to the dining room for members only? Maybe Mr. Perry can rearrange the dining room so one of the rooms--the big back room--has couches only all the time if he takes out five or six tables, or

maybe there is some way even the present space in the temporary period can incorporate what Mr. Mancini asks. I do not think what he is suggesting is unusual, if we can get some little bit of additional space and incorporate it as an adjunct to the dining room for members only and their guests and have a bit of a lounge facility, using the present staff. Maybe it is a two-stage operation.

Mr. Mancini: Can we defer the motion on closing the members' lounge until Mr. Perry comes back to us and says, "This is my temporary solution to the problem and in six months this is what the permanent solution will be?" In that way we can see what he has placed before us, we can see what we are going to get in six months' time, we can see what the actual changes will be and we will not be voting in the dark.

Mr. Rotenberg: A temporary solution he could bring us back, I am sure, but a permanent solution depends on relocating someone else.

Mr. Mancini: Yes. The Minister of Government Services and his deputy are here. They are listening to the conversation and I am sure they are picking up the tone.

Mr. Rotenberg: Possibly we could adopt what you say, Mr. Mancini--and I wonder if the minister could listen for a moment--and say we are going to close the north wing, move the lounge facilities temporarily into the dining room, but we want some more space for a more permanent lounge adjacent to the dining room. By having the north wing closed, there might be some way of moving the barber's shop over there or something else over there adjacent to the dining room so there would be some small amount of space, not nearly as big as the north wing, where we could have some lounge facilities attached to the dining room. That, I think, would solve the problem we all have and would certainly save us a lot of money by closing the north wing.

I may be persuaded to support a deferral of the motion until next week, having Mr. Perry and Government Services getting together and giving us some short-range and medium-range solutions to these problems. We may come up with an idea and we may not.

Mr. Mancini: I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. Kerr: What is your definition of a lounge? What type of service would you provide there?

Mr. Mancini: Basically, there would be some couches and chairs and TV in case there was some important political event that we would want to see.

Mr. Kerr: Have you ever been in the caucus lounge that we have, the Tory caucus lounge?

Mr. Mancini: No, I have not.

Mr. Kerr: Would you have food and drink available?

Mr. Mancini: Just sandwiches.

The Vice-Chairman: We have a motion before us. You have talked about a lot of solutions, I think there were a couple of good ones suggested, but as chairman I have to deal with the motion that is before me. It was moved by Mr. McLean that we recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the members' lounge be closed.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, I believe that Mr. Boudria made an amendment.

The Vice-Chairman: He made one but he is not here to present his resolution.

Mr. Mancini: I'd like to speak to the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'Neil: Go ahead.

Mr. Mancini: I'd like to ask the committee if we could wait until next week before we deal with that motion. Since we have the Minister of Government Services and Mr. Perry here, they could maybe take up the suggestion that Mr. Rotenberg and Mr. Kerr and I have been talking about on finding some permanent location, not as big as the location we have right now, and then we could deal with Mr. McLean's motion more adequately.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Mancini, just to get this cleared up, you would make a motion that Mr. McLean's motion should be tabled until next week.

Mr. Mancini: Yes. That's correct Mr. Chairman.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Mancini moves that Mr. McLean's motion be tabled until the next sitting of the Members' Services Committee.

That is an amendment to Mr. McLean's motion, so I'll deal with the amendment first.

Mr. Robinson: On a point of clarification, if I may, Mr. Chairman, just so we are absolutely certain of what Mr. Mancini's resolution may entail, the motion to table I guess takes precedent over almost everything else. Is it your intention, Mr. Mancini, that something else happen during this week period?

Mr. Mancini: Just that Mr. Wiseman, the minister and Mr. Perry get together and--

Mr. Robinson: Are you including that as part of the motion for the record?

Mr. Mancini: No, but they have listened to all of our discussions and I could include it in the motion if you like, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I could have our staff look at the

possibility of what space would be available to partition, the whole bit of the barber's shop and perhaps the nurse's section. We have a little bit of a problem of where to locate those people, but if you want to give up the lounge and the other area and maybe make a switch with the the consent of the Speaker.

Mr. Rotenberg: I think possibly a clarification of Mr. Robinson's point would be for Mr. Perry along with the ministry to bring us for the next meeting a short-term and medium-term interim solution to the problem of the members' lounge with the idea that the members' lounge will be part of or adjacent to the existing dining facilities.

Mr. Mancini: That was the tone of our conversation.

Mr. Rotenberg: That was your amendment.

Mr. Mancini: That was the tone of our conversation. The amendment is just to table the motion.

The Vice-Chairman: Do you have the amendment handy? I don't have it here.

Mr. Rotenberg: I think possibly, Mr. Chairman, with respect, if what Mr. Perry--

The Vice-Chairman: I think, Mr. Rotenberg, there is a plain, simple resolution before you, that the one moved by Mr. McLean be deferred until next week and that is what we are going to vote on. All these other things you are bringing into it are immaterial until next week. All those in favour of the amendment to the motion please signify.

Interjection: To deferral.

The Vice-Chairman: Yes, deferral.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Hodgson, for taking the chair. Inherent or implicit with the motion carrying is that we will return to this item in one week's time and perhaps we'll have a consolidation at that time.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: If we are going to do that, do you want us to if we can--and I'm not sure that we could do it that quickly--get an approximate cost of what it would take to renovate that area.

Mr. Chairman: I stand to be corrected but if I could have the committee's attention for just a moment we can try to bring some resolution to this thing because every time we bring it up we find a new wrinkle. There's nothing wrong with that, but perhaps this is now the time when we can defer the item.

We have deferred it. We will bring it back in one week's time and try to have everybody together proceeding in one unified

way to deal with a singular proposition, which would be to ultimately join a members' lounge to the main dining room or the vicinity of the main dining room facility and everything else becomes ancillary to that. Is that the wish of the committee?

Mr. Rotenberg: The members' lounge is much smaller than the present one, being a members-only lounge.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Wiseman, is that reasonable for you?

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder if I could ask the minister has the presentation you made today been made to cabinet too?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No. When we made the presentation a year ago, the members' services committee weren't too sympathetic to some of the suggestions. I think I'd like to know that even if you do not support wholeheartedly the presentation we made today, then at least you feel we're on the right track or would give us some sort of an indication.

5:30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: What the minister is suggesting is that he would like some sort of indication of approval, in principle, of his proposition to redevelop the north wing to accommodate the space requirements in this building beyond the year 2000.

Mr. Kerr: Oh, sure. What alternative have we?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, is that your request of committee?

Mr. Rotenberg: On a point of order: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this committee without a lot of discussion can do anything on that. There was a lot of information there. I certainly am not prepared to do anything but say no, unless we have time for discussion and we don't have that today, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Mr. Kerr: Approval in principle.

Mr. Rotenberg: There is an awful lot in there.

Mr. Kerr: Wait till you grandson comes down here in September. He has to have space.

Mr. Chairman: Would it be agreeable to committee that we schedule discussion of the issue of the redevelopment of the north wing at the earliest convenience, beyond this other matter which we have before us now? Is that agreeable?

Mr. Kerr: Sure thing. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I will make sure, Mr. Chairman, that everyone has a copy of what we are presenting before we come over.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. You have my assurance, as chairman, that we will schedule that at the very first opportunity and provide adequate time to discuss the matter thoroughly.

Mr. Rotenberg: The minister should also provide us with a summary or a list of all those who are presently using this building so we can ascertain whether there may be some people in this building who should not be here, which may change the space requirements.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I think maybe Mr. Allen has gone over those slides and eliminated some of them. In our presentation a year ago, we had that sort of information about who might have to leave the building, if we did not make some drastic changes.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, since we have asked that Mr. Perry meet with the Government Services people, would it be up to them to contact him to set this up?

Mr. Chairman: I would respectfully suggest, in light of other things that have happened during the past number of days, that the minister, the deputy minister and the minister's senior staff contact Mr. Perry through whatever the appropriate channels would normally be. The minister had given us his undertaking that he will initiate those discussions.

Mr. Mancini: We are counting on that.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Wiseman and gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Thanks very much and thanks for having us.

Mr. Chairman: We appreciate your time.

Item two has somehow now become, once again, interwoven into that. Mr. Perry, is there anything else you wanted to add on that today, or will you wait until you amalgamate your report?

Mr. Perry: I will wait.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Brannan, you have been very patient.

Mr. Mancini : You are getting off easy today, Mr. Perry.

Mr. Chairman: This is item three. Members will recall that the matter of the French transcription service was before us. You will recall that Mr. Brannan was here at the request of the committee at the last regular meeting to address a member's concern regarding the French transcription service. Frankly, a lot has occurred in that area since then. Perhaps Mr. Brannan can bring us up to date.

Mr. Brannan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All I can say is I believe most committee members know that the contractor who currently has the contract for providing French transcription

services has indicated his intention of resigning just about at the end of this session. I have two prospective companies lined up for possible continuation of this service, which we are currently investigating. Until we have looked into that thoroughly and have given them some testing to make sure they will be able to meet our needs, I cannot report too much more at this stage. But we are not sleeping on it.

Mr. Chairman: You are then interviewing, as it were, other people to replace that service. Is there anything, as you view it, that the members' services committee can do to facilitate that at this time, or shall we simply leave it with you?

Mr. Brannan: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is in hand. The contractor who is leaving has been kind enough to agree to continue until we can make other arrangements, so we are not going to be left in a jam through the summer if we do need French-language transcription services. I have no doubt that we will be able to fill the gap. I hope we will be able to provide adequate services in the future.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Is it the wish of the committee to receive Mr. Brannan's report? Are there any questions or comments? Do we have a motion to receive? Yes.

Mr. Boudria, because of your special interest in this, I would simply indicate to you that Mr. Brannan has just reported in a very brief way a summary of facts and that he is now interviewing other companies to replace the transcription service we had. The committee has just voted to receive his report with no other action.

Mr. Boudria: Fine.

Mr. Chairman: Do you wish to make a comment?

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps a few brief comments. The only thing I would like to say is that I was rather disappointed to get the letter from the Osgoode Technical Translation Services. When this meeting ended the last time, we arrived at the compromise that the majority of the members here voted on, which was supposed to be satisfactory to the majority of us and on which I compromised. I think that things at that point seemed to be in order and to be satisfactory to a majority of us.

It appears that the translation company had second thoughts afterwards and sent a letter which was not very kind to myself, to say the least, and decided to resign. I understand that the director of administration has sent a letter to them. I thought it would be in order for us to regret their resignation, but to reject the rest of their letter. I throw that out to the committee for discussion.

Mr. Kerr: We have to have a copy of the letter first. Do we have copies?

Mr. Chairman: Let me find out from Mr. Boudria exactly which letter he is referring to.

Mr. Boudria: The package that was sent by you, Mr. Chairman, to all of us.

Mr. Chairman: I instructed Mr. Richardson upon receipt of a package of information, which included the letter which Mr. Boudria refers to, that it be distributed to all members in their offices, and that was on that day.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Brannan, you may recall the last meeting when this discussion concerning the transcription of French took place. Basically, the complaint was that there was a time factor involved and, in order for some members to issue appropriate press releases and get the information out to their ridings, they wanted the time factor changed. In no way can I recall any attack on the quality of that service as to the transcription once it was completed.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, there was.

Mr. Mancini: There was? Which part was that? I do not recall it.

Mr. Boudria: We discussed the fact that it was inaccurate and sometimes the French had to be partly redone by my secretary and the secretary for the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) together.

Mr. Mancini: I see. I must have stepped out for that part. Anyway, there may have been a couple of suggestions as to the quality, but my recollection is that the main topic of debate was the time factor. I have read the May 29, 1981 letter from the Osgoode Technical Translation Services people to Mr. Fleming. I find the letter scurrilous, to say the least. The third paragraph on page one, where it says, "The French transcriber can be used for political target practice by certain MPPs," is without justification and without foundation. No one was directing any political comments or using the Osgoode Technical Translation Services people for any kind of political target practice whatsoever.

5:40 p.m.

I find it highly surprising that at the bottom of page three the people who were hired to transcribe the French into English would make a comment not only about the form of the speech, but also to the content of the speech. I am really surprised that they would make such a comment. If they are so good at form and content themselves, you would wonder why they are not seeking a seat in the Legislature.

I can see by this letter that maybe these people were looking for a way out of the contract that they had with the Legislature and decided to use this as an excuse. In my view, the letter distorted the true feelings and concerns the members of this committee had at that time. I am sure we will be able to find some well-qualified people to take their place, who won't have to express their opinion on the form and, specifically, on the content of what members have to say.

We are judged at every election as to our content and our participation here in the Legislature. We are willing to face that judgement and to accept whatever the people say.

It was also brought to my attention that someone questioned the way in which you handled that meeting a week or so ago, Mr. Chairman. I just want the record to show that, in my view, you handled the meeting in a superb way. In no way or at any particular time did you let the meeting get out of control. As a matter of fact, I think you conduct all our members' services committee meetings in a very good manner. For anyone to question the way that you handled the meeting is unbelievable. I do not know why anyone would do that. I am surprised that those types of letters are surfacing and are being circulated.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Mancini. Any further comment on the matter? The committee has already taken a vote to receive it. Mr. Boudria, were you moving a motion? You were not moving a motion.

Is there any further motion on the item? The motion to receive Mr. Brannan's report then will stand.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: We should return to the House very shortly for the vote on the private members' bills. The only other item left on today's agenda was the matter of other business.

Mr. McLean: I would like to get a copy of the guidelines and responsibilities of this committee. As a new member I am not aware of the guidelines we operate under. I would like to know the duties and responsibilities of this committee.

Mr. Chairman: We will certainly see to that request.

The committee adjourned at 5:44 p.m.



CAZ & N  
XC 23  
-M 27

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Also taking part:

McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister without Portfolio (Armourdale PC)

Acting Clerk: White, G.

From the Ministry of Government Services:

Bartha, J., Architectural Design, Architectural Section

Thatcher, J. C., Deputy Minister

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister

From the Office of the Legislative Assembly:

Perry, C., Manager, Members' Food and Beverage Services

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

The committee met at 3:50 p.m. in committee room No. 1.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES

Mr. Chairman: It appears we have a quorum. I call the meeting to order. Is it the wish of the committee that Mr. McCaffrey be heard?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Members of the committee, the chairman was good enough to hear me out on this matter about a week ago and, in order to facilitate the committee's work, asked that I try to get a memo to you before the summer recess.

I do not have the memo completed, but I did want before the fall session begins at least to share a concern that I had, having been chairman of a number of committees during the last parliament in which we heard public submissions--rent review, equal pay for work of equal value, and a few others. These were committees that sat when the House was sitting from 8 p.m. until 10.30 p.m. There are no facilities in this building for members of the public who come here for those evening hours to buy a cup of coffee or a package of cigarettes or to do anything they may wish to do in preparation for making a submission before the committee.

There is not a member of the committees that sit in these evening hours that has not sent a page to get a cup of tea or coffee or what have you from one of a couple of places available to us. I just think this would be something the members' services committee could address itself to. My suggestion, to be specific, would be that the cafeteria facility on the basement floor be open during those evening sessions when standing committees are hearing public submissions in order that they can at least sit down and have a sandwich. It may be people are on their way home from work, prior to an eight o'clock scheduling if they are first on, and are comparing notes on how they want to handle their presentation. Anything such as I have suggested would make it a little more civilized experience for them up here.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. McCaffrey?

Mr. Hodgson: How about some vending machines?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: We could well do it.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. McCaffrey has a point which is valid. Certainly if there is a mob here, as there has been for some of those hearings, there must be enough of a demand that would merit some service somewhere in the building. I would like to suggest or to move that the manager of the food services, who is here and has listened to this, take under advisement what he has heard and bring forward a suggestion to us at the beginning of the next session.

I do not even know if it is necessary to bring it back. If he can keep the cafeteria open some evenings of the week when the House is sitting--

Mr. Chairman: That is something we shall address ourselves to later.

Mr. Rotenberg: --I think he should consider it and maybe bring us a report so that we can have it at the beginning of the next session. We can act on it at that time.

Mr. Chairman: Very well. Mr. Perry, did you want to make any comment on Mr. McCaffrey's comments at this time?

Mr. Perry: No.

Mr. Chairman: But you will take it under advisement and perhaps report back?

Mr. Rotenberg moves that the matter be referred to Mr. Perry for his report on some way of providing some service to the public at times when the either select or standing committees are meeting and other facilities are not open.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. McCaffrey. You still have two and a half minutes to your credit.

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: Item number one on the agenda is possible relocation of members' facilities. Mr. Wiseman, you and your ministry were meeting with Mr. Perry and the administration of the Legislative Assembly and were to come back with some further information.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Yes. We have Julius Bartha, representing our architectural branch, here this afternoon to tell you what could be done with the space you asked us about. I shall let him talk and you may have some questions afterwards.

Mr. Bartha: Basically we have three rooms.

Mr. Chairman: Can you both speak up, and also hold that up? Perhaps you would not mind standing so that we can all see it.

Mr. Bartha: Just to orient ourselves, the dining room is here. The main basement corridor is right here.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. Mr. Perry, would you like to come forward to see this as it is going on in case there are questions of you as well?

Mr. O'Neil: Where is the main hallway again?

Mr. Bartha: That is the main corridor here, the basement corridor. The dining room is down here, and that is the entrance here. The stair is coming down from the upper levels here. We have the barbershop and the attendants from the House there at the moment, and these are the three rooms we propose to turn into a lounge.

There will be two entrances. The one entrance at present is serving the health room and the other one is serving the barbershop. The third one would be blocked. One of the three rooms, the third one, the one here in red, could have a small bar. We have all the water and the sanitary services for this area at the moment.

The three rooms would provide about 40 seats. The mechanical and the electrical systems and the wall finish would be updated to suit the new requirements.

Interjection: It involves the ceiling, too.

Mr. Bartha: The ceiling, as well, yes. We will provide something a little bit more of a lounge type than what you have now.

Mr. O'Neil: One of the points we have mentioned was by having it where it is now, the lounge needs additional help. I do not notice any way to get from this lounge into the dining room, other than by the hall.

Mr. Bartha: Yes.

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder if that does not create a problem in that you are still going to have somebody stuck in this lounge all the time. You are really not saving any money by moving the lounge from downstairs into this area here, are you?

Mr. Rotenberg: With those three rooms, that is the entrance now into the cabinet dining room, is it? Where your right hand is, further down, that one there.

Mr. Bartha: Yes.

Mr. Rotenberg: So you cannot get through.

Mr. Perry: That would not be a good arrangement.

Mr. McLean: Could you not have the door down at the bottom through into the lounge?

Mr. Rotenberg: That is the bulge in the building.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Those are load-bearing walls in between, and they are quite thick. That is why we have to leave the majority of them. To put an opening through, maybe you could tell them the costs.

Mr. Bartha: To update these three rooms--we are talking about 1,240 square feet altogether--the estimated total project cost would be about \$160,000, furniture included.

Mr. Chairman: Does that include the cost of moving the existing facilities now?

Mr. Bartha: No.

Mr. Chairman: What would be the cost of relocating those facilities?

Mr. Bartha: To relocate the health centre, the barbershop and the attendants would be about \$100,000.

Mr. Chairman: Another \$100,000.

Mr. O'Neil: Where you have the entrance from the dining room into the cabinet lounge, is there any way you could cut an entrance here so that people would not have to be going out into the hall, but could come directly from the dining room, say, into both lounges?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: You could, but that would make Grand Central Station out of the cabinet lounge. They often use that phone for phone calls when they are trying to get lunch.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, when they have finished questions, I want to say something.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Wiseman, do you have any further comment or conclusion on that proposition?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: It looks to me like an expensive proposition for what we are getting. I wondered if you are not making good use of the present dining room--thinking now as a businessman--by using it a couple of hours for breakfast, a couple for lunch and a couple for dinner. What if we said, why not open it up and use part of it for a bar at other times?

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Bartha. Mr. Perry, do you wish to offer anything from your perspective on either that plan or the overall situation?

4 p.m.

Mr. Perry: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. Having thought about the area and going around with Ministry of Government Services personnel, I had one further thought on the matter of a members' lounge, particularly as we have discussed the underutilization of the present rooms. The only suggestion that I can make is that the ministers' dining room is underutilized and would perhaps, as it

already contains a bar, make an ideal lounge. We could make what we call annex number three in the dining room, which is the piece opposite the main bar, into the minister's dining room. It would certainly be a far cheaper alternative than the one we are listening to.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Speaking as a minister having been there lots of times, although you say it is underutilized, I have been down there for lunch when I could not find a table and had to go elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman: You are suggesting, Mr. Wiseman, that that might not meet with enthusiastic favour among your executive council colleagues?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Speaking for myself, I do not think it would fly.

Mr. O'Neil: I am just wondering if you did that you might cut down the number of people you could accommodate for lunch and dinner too. It might turn them away.

Mr. Perry: Whatever I look at one of the major problems is the lack of space. It is quite true that when the ministers' room is used, if they have more than 22 people in there it is far too crowded, and it is the same with the executive room or room three.

Mr. O'Neil: With respect to that part that is opposite the bar that you were talking about turning into the cabinet dining room, is there any way that part of that, or one end, could be set up with a couple of couches or some lounge chairs so that could be the members' lounge?

Mr. Perry: It would still be a very open members' lounge. One of the problems with the present members' lounge seems to be that everybody can use it. Therefore, the members cannot talk confidentially with any visitors they may have. My suggestion of using the dining room was only going to be a temporary one.

Mr. Rotenberg: The dining room now, of course, is open to the public at lunch time and dinner time and so on. Could you give any estimate off the top of your head, just standing watching the people come in, what percentage of your business is members and their guests and what percentage is people who have nothing to do with this place? There is staff, too, who come in from time to time.

Mr. Perry: If I count staff and visitors to the building, which may not necessarily be guests of members, I would say that on many occasions 60 per cent of the customers we have are outsiders.

Mr. Rotenberg: What would happen if that members' dining room, like the dining room they have in Ottawa, was restricted to members and guests and those staff who are authorized by members to use the dining room? You would have a lot less business but then you would have less staff and so on. Could you have a viable operation?

Mr. Perry: No. If I lose 60 per cent of the customers, then I will lose 60 per cent of the revenue.

Mr. Rotenberg: Let me try a different tack. How often is the place crowded to the extent that you cannot accommodate all those who want to come in?

Mr. Perry: At least half the days of the year, particularly in the fall season. There are many days when we turn away as many as 40 people.

Mr. Rotenberg: But they would be members of the public; they would not be--

Mr. Perry: That is correct, yes.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Following up on that, because it is very difficult for us to put together figures, I have contemplated and discussed this with you, Mr. Perry, a number of times and I guess you can look at it two ways, as we have. One, you can expand the operation and hope to better utilize the kitchen, the area and the staff. We have not seen that yet, although I believe Mr. McLean asked for that.

For cost accounting, really I guess you would have to do it hourly and in some respects maybe by the minute. It follows on Mr. Rotenberg's questions because we look at these things, and that is an unfair look possibly. You say you go in the morning and see four people sometimes, matched equally by four staff, visibly, not by the people in the back who may be cooking. When we look at the process of your operation, it is heavy on wages whereas the food is supposed to be coming out at cost or some manner or method like that.

I am just wondering if you did cut back the area, did cut back the staff hours and had a combined lounge and food service, whether that would be the route, rather than expansion to get this deficit. Of course the deficit shows up as members' deficit, whereas when you talk about 60 per cent, it is 60 per cent of the public, be they civil servants, be they press gallery people, be they visitors; that 60 per cent deficit is running the restaurant at a deficit. Could we go smaller and thus make a saving, rather than trying to go larger and try to make more money?

I do not know, I am not in the restaurant business, but I would look at both of those as alternatives. I do not think we have enough information as members to measure that.

Mr. Perry: One of the major problems is you still need a minimum number of staff whether you are serving one luncheon or 100 luncheons. You still need a dishwasher and a chef and a waitress and cashier. Once you have got past the minimum number of staff, the numbers you have to add on to cater for a lot more people is minimal.

Mr. Rotenberg: Does your staff work a guaranteed number of hours a week?

Mr. Perry: No, only the stewards. The waitresses do not, no.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I guess that is where we lose. An operation outside would have the waitress taking the money, might even be yelling the order in and serving it and the dishes would be washed later on when the dishwasher came in, whereas they are all in at once in your operation.

Mr. Watson: If you do not have the guaranteed staff, why do you on different occasions have--it shows up at breakfast--four people there for three people having breakfast?

Mr. Perry: Only one waitress is basically brought into the dining room breakfast service. The other two waitresses are preparing food for the cafeteria, sandwiches. We may have a number of luncheons on that require sandwich service and the waitresses are preparing those as well. I think if we have a breakfast meeting you may see two waitresses around, one serving the ministers' dining room. Quite recently we have had as many as 40 or 60 people in for breakfast.

Mr. Watson: But you were there, Bonny was there, the cashier and the waitress were there. That is four people, and there were two people having breakfast.

Mr. Rotenberg: You and Bonny and the cashier are there eight hours a day.

Mr. Perry: I am often there for 13 hours a day, but it does not make any difference.

Mr. Watson: I am following the same one and it is that perception that I think Mr. Taylor put. He said those are the ones that are visible and we know there are others who are not visible. The dishwasher is there and the chef is there. It must be difficult. Do you have to have a guaranteed number of hours for these people?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: You would obviously lose at breakfast. Every time a breakfast is served, that is a loss.

Mr. Perry: Yes, but it is often very difficult, particularly if members decide to have a breakfast meeting. If I only employ people whom I can tell they are only going to be employed at lunch time, I can often get staff, say, from a hotel where they can work in the evenings. But if I want to bring somebody in who is willing to come in one morning a week at seven o'clock for an early morning breakfast, and she also works in hotels, I just cannot get this sort of person.

4:10 p.m.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Another thing was puzzling me the other day which is along the same line. You have two different menu prices at noon hour and supper, different ranges. I do not

know who sets those. That is comparable to an outside restaurant, for whatever reasons outside restaurants prepare different price ranges. That seems strange because the meals of lunch and supper are somewhat similar--and indeed some in restaurants are--except for the price change. How is that rationalized in the sense of our operation?

When I sit down at the table, if I am being subsidized as a member and the whole thing is being subsidized, why is there a difference in the price? And when you get down to it there are more members at the evening meal than at the noon hour. That seems strange to me. I had never bothered looking at it before in the way we are looking at it now and it seems a strange conundrum to me that there are two prices.

Mr. Perry: We do have a different à la carte menu in the evenings. We have steak and items that we can cook in the kitchen because we know we are not going to get as many people in. To put steaks on my menu at lunch time would be impossible, simply because I do not have the facilities to prepare a wide range of items.

I suppose the reasoning is that when the provincial auditor came around and insisted that we try to at least reduce our costs, one of the areas that was costing money was the overtime. Although my staff are brought in on a time clock system whereby I try to bring them in when I require them, if the House sits three nights a week, which it is doing at the present time, I do run into overtime.

Mr. Rotenberg: You could have a staff who would come in for evening shift and pay them straight time.

Mr. Perry: No, because it is so erratic.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, in a restaurant that size, I fail to see the need of a cashier and a hostess. I would think that any time you are that busy and you are around there, you could certainly take the cash. That would not be a big job; I always like doing that. I would think that neither one of them is very busy at any time and that one person could do both jobs quite easily. I would think that the east end of that dining room could be used. If you wanted to put some tables here for people to come in and use it as a lounge, they could do that.

Mr. O'Neil: We are back to whether we leave the lounge where it is or whether we use the dining room that is there at present and just put in some section of it at one end or one corner.

Mr. Chairman: No, in fairness, to go back to the original proposition which is one that is contained in the report of Mr. Perry which is dated May 25, that says: "Both the chief steward and one steward in the press gallery lounge are due to retire at the end of June. You will recall in the face of the \$284,000 deficit and faced with the economies that might accrue from attrition in this situation, we began to examine the possibilities of substantial saving by closing that lounge and not having to rehire the staff and possibly accommodating it somewhere else." That is where all this began and where we are all back to.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, I think you have summarized where we are at. There has been a discussion about the north lounge for quite a while, since I have been here, and the fact that there is very little use made of it by members and it is very heavily subsidized. It is bad enough to subsidize members and their guests and it is another thing to subsidize other people, especially when it is almost totally a lounge area and not a dining area.

I would like to make a three-part motion. I will explain what I will say and then make the motion at the end. The first thing is I do not think there is any question in my mind that the north lounge should be closed at the end of this sitting, whenever we get out of here. If the stewards are retiring at the end of this week, maybe they would stay on another week. I am sure that place could be staffed for another week.

Second, I think there is a need for a members' lounge in this building. I do not think now is the time to build a new members' lounge. I feel that a members' lounge should be incorporated within the existing dining room area. There is very little requirement for lounge facilities at lunch time, which is really the heavy time. Certainly at dinner time I do not think the number of people who come in is nearly as many as come in at lunch, so I would think that during the dinner hour, and certainly during the evening hour and the late afternoon, a lounge could be accommodated within the existing space in the dining room.

It may require--and I think we should leave this at least for the present more or less in Mr. Perry's discretion--some slight shift in furniture. He may take that room number three and shift it slightly and maybe give up one or two tables for all the time, including lunchtime, in order to have a bit of a lounge in there, but I do not think that room by itself would be large enough. Within the existing walls of that area, some of the existing furniture could be used and maybe some of the furniture in the north wing. Mr. Perry, as the operator, would have to decide his mix between tables and couches or maybe have no couches at all and keep it all for a dining area at lunchtime. I would leave that to his discretion.

I think we should instruct him to have a lounge area open during the time that the House is sitting, that is, until six o'clock on days when the House does not sit in the evening, and through until 10:30 p.m. when it does, maybe even a little later than that. It will be by trial and error. He may want to leave it open until eleven o'clock on days the House sits in the evening.

The stewards who are there now who are handling the dining room, I am sure, can handle that as well. There are some waitresses and so on who are in for lunch and in for dinner and I guess get paid somewhat in between. With a little bit of judicious staff management, I am sure that could be handled basically with no additional payroll. Mr. Chairman, that is the second part of what I would like to do.

The third thing is the lounge should be somewhat on a trial basis to see how it goes and how much more use would be made of it. I do not want to abandon the idea of a more permanent members' lounge with a much better setting. The plan that the minister has come up with today has some merit to it. I am not prepared to adopt it at this stage because it requires considerable money, plus some staffing problems, plus relocation problems of the other areas. I would indicate that in principle I am in favour of a continuing members' lounge. If the lounge in the present dining area shows a better usage by members and their guests, then we should proceed to investigate in the fall or later on a different type of members' lounge.

I would say to Mr. Perry, but possibly not put it in the motion I am about to make, that if he is going to have, as part of the members' lounge, dining room number three as a lounge area, as distinguished from a dining room area. If it is even just for certain off-dinner hours rather than on-hours, in any area which is identifiable as a lounge area I would like to see at least part of that area made for members and their guests only to distinguish between members and other people who come in.

If you are going to be open anyway during the afternoon or during the evening, with the same number of staff you probably can serve drinks to members of the public who come in, and recover some of the staff costs. I would not like at this stage the whole thing to be restricted, but if there are going to be definable areas within the lounge at times other than the food-serving hours, some of those definable areas should be for members and guests only.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Rotenberg moves, first, we recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that the members' lounge in the north wing be closed at the end of this sitting when we adjourn for the summer; second, that Mr. Perry and his staff be requested to provide lounge facilities within the existing dining room area from noon until 6 p.m. only on days when the House sits and from noon until 10:30 or 11 p.m. on days when the House sits in the evening.

Mr. Rotenberg, let me just clarify that with you for one moment. You are suggesting that the lounge be open during those times when meal service is not now going on though overlapping the hours that exist now in the other facility.

Mr. Rotenberg: Yes, that should be when meal service is not going on, so it really would probably be from 2:30 p.m., but within those hours.

Mr. Chairman: To continue with the motion: Third, that the committee postpone consideration of the suggestion made by the ministry as far as a permanent members' lounge is concerned until such time as we ascertain the usage of the members' lounge in the dining room, but the committee does approve in principle that there shall always be in this building a members' lounge of some form.

Mr. O'Neil: I wonder, in making that motion, if you are saying that the lounge would only be open after the luncheon service. Maybe it should be open from 12 noon so that if they want people can go in for a drink and then have something to eat afterwards.

Mr. Rotenberg: I suggested the lounge be open from 12 noon on. It is up to Mr. Perry to decide.

Mr. Hodgson: You cannot have it open before 12 because you cannot serve liquor before 12.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Perry should decide how he serves drinks during the noon hour. I would leave that mix to him at the present time. This is an experimental thing. If he wants only to serve drinks with meals during that time, he has the little area outside, the waiting room, where he serves drinks, which is almost a lounge area. If this is to be an experiment or a trial basis, which it is, we have to leave it somewhat to Mr. Perry's management discretion how he is going to set it up and when he is going to serve drinks only and when he is going to serve drinks with meals. I am content, at least in the initial stage, to let him do it. I am sure a number of members will give him advice, depending on the requirements.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: We never seems short of getting advice. Do you have a suggested time frame in mind for this trial basis?

Mr. Rotenberg: I would say till the end of this calendar year and that the whole matter be reviewed at the beginning of the 1982 session.

Mr. Chairman: Would you prefer to link it to the fiscal year?

Mr. Rotenberg: No. We come back in March 1982 and will start reviewing it then. We will not make any changes, I am sure, in the first or second meeting of this committee in March 1982, so it will be into the new fiscal year before any other change will be made. We will have had the fall session as a trial. When we come back next March, at least we will get a handle on it. We may say, "Okay, let it run for another six months." I think it should be back on this committee's agenda in March.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I was going to say that our friend Eddie Sargent runs a pretty good establishment. He has the very same setup as Mr. Rotenberg has recommended. Eventually over the evening, it all becomes a bar, but it starts off with a roped-off area for dinner and he can just move that roping out for as many as he wants to accommodate. Then about eight o'clock it becomes a full bar. It works well and is done orderly. I don't know if you have ever been there.

Mr. Watson: Do you know if he is making money or not?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I don't know. You will have to ask him.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the motion?

Mr. Samis: If we are talking the dinner hour of, say, from 12 to 2 p.m., what would will be the actual seating capacity of this lounge area?

Mr. Perry: If I use room three as a lounge area, I would think it could seat 20 people around the tables.

Mr. Samis: Just so I get my bearings, that is the small dining room to the east.

Mr. Perry: The one opposite the main bar right at the end.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Minister, what will be done with the old lounge while we embark on this experiment?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I had not really thought about that. That comes under the Speaker at the present time. If the Speaker gave that back over to us, I am sure we could find lots of uses for it.

Mr. Samis: Just in case the experiment did not work out, then we would really behind the eight ball, wouldn't we?

Mr. Rotenberg: Things go slowly enough in this government and in this building.

Mr. Samis: With a majority government?

Mr. Rotenberg: By next March that space will still be there not having been used by that time.

Mr. Samis: That is one promise you will keep?

Mr. Chairman: Oh, now I am sure you did not mean to be unduly partisan when you said that.

Mr. Samis: Oh, of course I did.

Mr. Chairman: As part of Mr. Rotenberg's motion, I would point out for clarification that contained in it is approval in principle, or the adoption of the principle, that there will always be a permanent members' lounge facility in this building.

Mr. Samis: Yes, but this is being set up as an experiment, as a temporary facility, to see if it is feasible, to see if it meets public acceptance, et cetera?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is.

Mr. Rotenberg: In the long run, if it works out that the members' needs are satisfied by this convertible dining room and

lounge situation, then we can do it with expenditure. But if the demand is too great, convenient location, rather than the north wing and we get a lot of business, then maybe we can should assess where we are going. I am not pr couple of hundred thousand dollars to build a n can make do without that sort of thing.

Mr. Samis: As long as that principle is est.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I understand what motion is, but one part that bothers me even hours, when you convert it at lunch hour and a those possible 20 tables.

Mr. Samis: Twenty chairs.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Twenty individuals, Rotenberg has come up with this solution, and it been tossing around. To give that alternative emotional feeling that it belongs to the members lounge along with guests, one would have to say f it is there, it should be segregated as a members' even during the hours when meals are served. If a able to do at present, wanted to sit and have a be a sandwich or a pop and a sandwich or a coffee and could do so in the lounge facility, still being main dining room, say, with a sandwich menu, an still sit in a lounge-style facility.

Granted you are losing a possible 20 places, crowded times during noon hours, I think that would better trial period than saying, "It's noon hour putting tables in." That may take place till 2 p.m. depending on how quickly you get the tables moved of there. Also, you have the problem of somebody ha meeting room.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Taylor, my suggestion wa convert that room three to a lounge, it would be m all times. Also, I would consider that after eight dinner is over, we might try it as a members' lou were night sittings, for members and their guests open to the public. Let's give that kind of thing a members and guests can generate enough business to ha lounge.

Mr. O'Neil: If they are having a sand members' lounge, they are not taking up room in th either.

Mr. Rotenberg: That's right. If number t part of the lounge, that part should be a members-only

Mr. Hodgson: But you just cannot have it only.

Mr. Rotenberg: Members and their guests.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute.

Mr. Hodgson: I have had my hand up three or four times.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry, Mr. Hodgson, by all means.

Mr. Hodgson: I was wondering about this room on the second floor which is used occasionally for receptions. We have all been in it at different times.

Mr. Samis: Such as now.

Mr. Hodgson: Yes. Now there is a reception in it. That would make an awfully good lounge area.

Mr. Rotenberg: But the problem is you have to have different staff.

Mr. Hodgson: Staff isn't a big loss in this case. Staff wages are not \$275,000.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Wiseman, do you have any comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That one is used right now for sessional offices more than it ever was because a lot of ministers still do not have sessional offices because of a commitment given by the Board of Internal Economy that every member would have an outside office. We could not give that up now, and I do not see it so in the future. A lot of parliamentary assistants use that.

Mr. Hodgson: I for one am not very keen on the idea of turning the dining room or any part of it into a members' lounge. As you said, in the fall you often turn 40 people away a day. There is no room for them to sit down now. What are you going to do when you turn them down?

Mr. Chairman: That is exactly the point I was trying to make before you indicated that I had not recognized you. Please jump in if I do not have it correctly. The lounge that has been proposed by Mr. Rotenberg would be in operation only in hours that the dining room is not normally serving.

Mr. Rotenberg: I was going to leave that to Mr. Perry's discretion. The part that he calls room three, if he feels he could do it, could be turned into a members' only lounge, even during the lunch time which, as someone has said, would siphon the members off from the tables.

Frankly, I am not too worried if some members of the public who have no relationship to this place get turned away because every meal they buy costs us money since every meal they buy is subsidized. Members and guests never get turned away. That is all I am concerned about. I am not concerned if somebody walks in off the street and gets turned away because room three has become a members' lounge.

Mr. Hodgson: In reference to what Mr. Rotenberg has said, we have secretaries in this building, every one of us. Some members have two, if they are lucky. I have one. But those secretaries have an hour for lunch and have to go down and sit three quarters of an hour or an hour before they get in. You are losing a lot of time that way.

Mr. Rotenberg: Do you want to restrict the public and just have members and their employees? That would solve the secretary problem.

A lot of these other management problems really are not related to the lounge. We started getting into them earlier when Mr. Perry was first before us. Not today, but some other time, we might want to get into some of the other management problems and who uses the dining room. But the agenda before us today is strictly what to do about the north wing members' lounge. We should solve that problem and get at the other problems some other time.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the motion? It is a three-part motion. We will split the motion and deal with the parts individually. The first part of the motion is to close the north wing members' lounge at the end of this sitting.

Mr. O'Neil: Should it be individually? I think it all pertains to one.

Mr. Rotenberg: They are all interdependent. I would not close that unless you get the other ones passed.

Mr. Chairman: All right. We will put it all back together then.

The first part of the motion is to close the north wing members' lounge at the end of this sitting. The second part of the motion is to incorporate a members' lounge within the existing members' dining room facility through the use of existing staff. The third is that this change be done on a trial basis until the end of the calendar year, and that this committee reconsider the ongoing matter of the need for a permanent facility sometime early in 1982. Those recommendations would all be forwarded to the Board of Internal Economy.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Rotenberg: The motion should include that the committee does endorse that there shall always be a member's lounge on these premises. That has to be in the motion.

Mr. Chairman: The preamble to the motion then should probably be that "This committee endorses the principle that a permanent member's lounge should always exist within the framework of this building." Does everybody have the drift of the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: In the report of Mr. Perry from May 25, and I would just like the committee to concur on these other recommendations again, just so he is clear on the direction, the member's lounge was part one. Part two, if you recall, was moving the accounting for the press gallery deficit out of members' services and back into administration. Is there any difficulty with that? The third part deals with extending the hours to the cafeteria operation when the House is in session to permit out-of-town members, if it is their desire, to eat there in the evening.

Mr. Rotenberg: That was Mr. McCaffrey's point, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It is part of it. This was raised by Mr. Boudria, as I recall, inasmuch as there wasn't somewhere on nights when the House didn't sit where members could get any food service at all from the building. Mr. Perry has come back and indicated that by making a couple of adjustments at a certain cost premium, that service could be extended.

Mr. Rotenberg: I think, Mr. Chairman, we should do that on a trial basis, again until the end of the year, and review it to see what it costs and what the demand for it is.

Mr. Chairman: Are you agreeable to amending the recommendation that those extended hours only be done on a trial basis until the end of the year?

Agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Perry, are there any other loose ends on that that we should tie up?

Mr. Perry: No.

Mr. Rotenberg: I move that we adjourn.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute. Mr. Wiseman.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Before we leave, I just wondered if you were thinking of having an exercise room for fall, we would have to know fairly soon if you want that. If you do not, that is fine with us. But it would have to be done over the summer recess.

Mr. Chairman: Let me refresh the committee's memory, Mr. Minister, if I may. Mr. Wiseman was before us a week ago and I had some preliminary discussion with him prior to that. In the existing area adjoining the soon-to-be-defunct member's lounge in the north wing, there is room for him to install a fitness facility. If it was the wish of this committee, that recommendation would have to go on to the Board of Internal Economy, if it was something that we could do concurrent with the matter of the closing or other adjustments that we are making. I am at the pleasure of the committee on that.

Mr. Rotenberg: Like the committee room which used to be the NDP caucus room?.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is used now, I believe, by the library on a temporary basis.

Mr. Samis: Are you saying that the whole thing is available for an exercise room?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: That room could make a good exercise room now. We could use the washroom facilities that are there, take a small corner out of it to accommodate the ladies and still leave shower facilities and everything.

Mr. Samis: Basically our old caucus room, the whole thing is available as a potential exercise room?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Well, if it was available, the Board of Internal Economy would have to find some other place for the library staff that are in there temporarily. It was looked at in 1975. At that time the cost was about \$40,000 to do it. Now I am told it would be more like \$60,000. We have a plan for it that was put on back in 1975, but then we needed it for a caucus room and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have a price tag for that plan, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Today's prices would be about \$60,000 for the exercise room and the washroom facilities that would accommodate the ladies as well as the men. It is quite large at the present time. We could have some lockers and maybe a sauna in there and an area that would be blocked off for the women.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I move that that area be dealt with as the minister has indicated over the summer months and that it go to the Board of Internal Economy for approval, that the area so designated become a members' exercise area.

Mr. Rotenberg: For members only.

Mr. Samis: Can I ask who would make the decision on what would go in that, the principle of it?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We could bring it back and let you see what we propose putting in. I believe the drawing shows basically what would go in it.

Mr. O'Neil: If you have to come back and we are not here, I think somebody has to make a decision if you are going to go ahead with it over the summer months.

Mr. Rotenberg: Would someone who is expert in physical fitness design what kind of facilities you are building?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: It was hoped, when we talked about this just briefly, that maybe we could open it for certain hours of the day with some person from the Y or somebody here to help at very little cost, so we would not have to have someone there on a full-time basis.

Mr. Samis: I agree with the idea of an exercise room. I just hope it does not get into the concept of some sort of professional fitness club. I would like to see some opportunity given just for recreation within that room, that is, something like a ping-pong table or a punching bag or an exercycle. I just like the idea of recreation.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Most of the things you mentioned except the ping-pong table were in the proposal.

Mr. Samis: Just think of the therapeutic value of two of those three devices for people like us.

Mr. O'Neil: I disagree with that. A ping-pong table is fine and dandy, but I would sooner see something along the health line where a person could get some proper exercise.

Mr. Samis: I would really argue in terms of stress and things like that these things have immense value.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I know this one showed weights and it showed bicycles.

Mr. Samis: That is my point. I want to see some aspect of recreation beyond weight lifting and that stuff.

Mr. Rotenberg: We could have a punching bag with Bill Davis' face on it for you guys and one with Cassidy's face on it for us.

Mr. Samis: Cassidy, Davis, whoever you want.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Thatcher, do you remember what all those were?

Mr. Chairman: The minister is just checking on the facility.

Mr. Thatcher: The layout indicated weights and benches and what is known as a multipurpose machine which has several positions and specific exercises can be performed there. It also had a number of exercycles, which are quite popular and a fairly mild form of exercise. We thought that probably the main purpose of it is for members who have been sitting for long hours to get the kinks out.

We thought if we could have a supervisor there to go through the exercises, we could have probably different styles of exercises. We could have stretching exercises for those who just want to do that and we could have something a little more vigorous for those who want to do that.

In addition to the fitness room, we could also use the present member's lounge for relaxation because I think after working out hard, most people like to sit down for a little while before proceeding to something else.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Samis, would you prepared to consider a tandem situation, where we go with the fitness facility in the more westerly portion of the space down there and then--

Mr. Samis: I was just going to ask if there is any provision for something more of a recreational nature in addition to what you are saying.

Mr. O'Neil: There would be, if we have the room for relaxation, and they set up a couple of things up that would do what you are talking about.

Mr. Thatcher: I think so, Mr. Chairman. That would be the best way to do it because the room we had allocated for equipment was pretty well filled with equipment, and the member's lounge here probably would not be filled by people who were just taking a break before passing on. If you wanted a pool table and a ping-pong table, I would think they could be provided.

Mr. Chairman: Could that be incorporated then in your proposition if it goes to the Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. Samis: I would support the recommendation if that concept included some provision for recreational activities.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor, are you prepared to amend your motion to include that concept?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Taylor moves that the Minister of Government Services take before him a recommendation from this committee to the Board of Internal Economy that approval be sought for the fitness facility proposed and presented through the Board of Internal Economy; and that also on an ad hoc and temporary basis during the ongoing experiment in the dining room that certain recreational facilities or tools be temporarily installed in the area now taken up by the north wing lounge.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Would you like us to take that from that motion or would you like to make that part of your motion?

Mr. Chairman: We are making that part of the motion. We are recommending to the Board of Internal Economy that it consider favourably your proposal relating to both those areas.

Motion agreed to.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. O'Neil, do you want to raise anything under other business?

Mr. O'Neil: I know that you and I were discussing before the meeting started that the members' services committee might look at some of the services that are offered, maybe not only in Ottawa but in the legislature in Quebec City. I know I would like to have a look at what facilities are offered in both of those places if we had a chance to visit them this summer for a few days.

Mr. Chairman: From a practical standpoint, we have not struck a budget for this committee.

I should have said at the outset, and I am sorry Mr. Rotenberg has left, it saddens me to report that Mr. Richardson is not here with us today due to the sudden passing of his wife yesterday. On behalf of the committee and our staff I would extend deepest sympathies for all of us to the Richardson family and hope that he is back with us shortly.

Mr. O'Neil: Would it be proper to send some flowers from the committee?

Mr. Chairman: I understand from the acting clerk that he had specifically requested that that not be done. But I would certainly hope that we would send him a written copy of our condolences.

As I started to say, the budget has not yet been struck and as we are not scheduled to meet again, or are meeting at the call of the chair now, we would have to impose on the acting clerk to put a budget together which might reflect that sort of trip in it, and it would have to be approved by the Board of Internal Economy before we could do anything at all.

Would you be agreeable to striking a budget to bring back at the first meeting of the fall and find some opportunity during either the fall session or perhaps immediately after Christmas to make that jaunt around? All I am saying is from a practical standpoint I am not sure we can get it back here in time to do it during the summer, unless we meet again specifically for that purpose.

Due to the expert efficiency of the acting clerk, he said that if we give him 10 minutes and tell him where you want to go, he will have a budget back here for us today. Do you want to make a motion, Mr. O'Neil?

Mr. O'Neil: In our discussion Quebec City had been mentioned, but I would not mind myself, and whatever the rest of the committee members want, having a look at some of the facilities in Ottawa and then maybe go on to Quebec because it is on the same way. Perhaps we could spend two or three days in each place having a look at the facilities.

Mr. Samis: I support the motion, but I brought up the similar question at the beginning about contacting all 10 legislatures to get an idea of what they had. First of all, have you had correspondence and, second, received any reply? I emphasize I support the motion.

Mr. Hodgson: Maybe Ottawa does not have any facilities. Does Quebec have any facilities?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. O'Neil and I agreed on those, I guess, because we have some knowledge of them.

Mr. O'Neil: They certainly have dining facilities.

Mr. Chairman: They have fine facilities, indeed. However, there is wisdom perhaps in what Mr. Samis suggests, that rather than try to strike a budget and go off to see them--

Mr. Samis: No, I did not say rather than, I said--

Mr. Chairman: No, excuse me, I was suggesting personally, as a first step, we find out what everybody has, and there might be places that might be more intriguing or more interesting than those two.

Mr. Samis: Obviously, it was not done then, you are saying. I had asked you to contact all 10 legislatures, plus the federal Parliament.

Mr. Chairman: I honestly do not recall a motion to that effect. I would happy to check the record to see if there was.

Mr. Samis: I certainly raised the issue that we should find out what services are offered in all 10 legislatures, plus the federal Parliament.

Mr. Chairman: As I say, forgive me for not recalling it and bringing it back to mind. I do not recall it at the moment.

Mr. Samis: In lieu of that, I think Mr. O'Neil's motion makes sense then.

Mr. Chairman: Could we do this realistically, Mr. O'Neil, in one swing of two days in Ottawa and two days in Quebec so that it would be four days and three nights or something along that line?

Mr. O'Neil: If you are going to go, why not spend a couple of nights in Ottawa and at least two or three in Quebec City and have a look at it?

Mr. Chairman: Three days in each then for the sake of round numbers. The clerk suggests that for the sake of simplicity, and rather than trying to draw it together now, we simply say a week.

We can recess for 10 minutes and come back at five o'clock on the nose if we could and put this together. Just before we go, and I can probably do this without the clerk, three other things under other business have been drawn to my attention that we might want to consider as time goes by. I will just briefly outline them to you in case you have any preliminary comments.

The first is the matter of the television lights within the House itself. On warm days they are universally unpopular. I am led to believe that the lights that are there now, the six lights, two banks of three on opposite sides, have been on loan to us from the CBC for five or more years now. They were never designed to be permanent and the administration of the Legislative Assembly may be looking into that to see what could be better done to cut the candle power or cut the heat or cut the glare or do something with them.

Another suggestion that has come to my attention is the matter of this particular building being a tourist attraction. All tours of the city of Toronto put on by the TTC in conjunction with the Gray Coach Lines bring people either by or to this facility as a main tourism attraction of Metropolitan Toronto, but this building is not accessible on weekends. While there are tours of this building throughout the week, there is no tour facility and no access to the building at all on weekends.

A suggestion was made for us, as a committee, to consider at some point whether or not we should, particularly during the summer months, have this building or parts of this building accessible to the public on weekends. Also, we might stagger the hours that our tour guides work now, or do something along that line, so that if groups of people are in Metropolitan Toronto over the weekend, they could come and tour here.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, I do not object to that but is that a service to members?

Mr. Chairman: It is difficult to know exactly where that might fall. The other thing we could hang our hats on a little more is another suggestion that would lead to the ultimate restoration of the furnishings in this building to match the period of the building over a period of time. That is something, from our standpoint at least as office users in this facility, that would fall under member's services and something that we might want to consider in the fall. When the acting clerk comes back, if there is no other business then we will recess.

The committee recessed at 4:50 p.m. and resumed at 4:58 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. Chairman: We are back in session. The acting clerk has presented to us a budget to be forwarded to the Board of Internal Economy in the amount of \$12,451 which reflects a week, probably in Ottawa and Quebec City, though to be determined later on, and the other ongoing expenses.

Mr. Watson: Are we not going to pass that other Legislative Assembly Act or whatever it is?

Mr. Chairman: What other Legislative Assembly Act?

Mr. Watson: Are we not going to pass that before we leave on the services and the per diem rates.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: That does not affect this.

Mr. Chairman: Whatever they are at that time, they would automatically accrue whatever the changes in the thing are.

Mr. Kerr: This does not say where we are going. You say it is Ottawa and Quebec City.

Mr. Chairman: This reflects a week of travel, tentatively to Ottawa and Quebec City and tentatively for the first week in October.

Mr. Samis: For some of us it would be less because we would not go to Toronto to go to Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing in ball park maxima at this point.

Mr. Watson: What is translation services?

Mr. O'Neil: In Quebec City I imagine we would have to have translation services.

Mr. Watson: I am a bit touchy about it. I had one letter translated one year. I had \$127 for translation services and I thought it was a bit much.

Mr. Chairman: Where are you reading translation services?

Mr. Watson: I did not; it is a touchy point.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we increase the budget then by \$100 for translation services?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: If Mr. Samis goes, there is no problem. What he does not know, I know.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Kerr moves that the budget be passed to the Board of Internal Economy.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any further business? We will adjourn.

The committee adjourned at 5.03 p.m.



CAZON  
XC 23  
-M 27

Government  
Publications  
M-5

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES  
VISIT TO OTTAWA AND QUEBEC CITY  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)

VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)

Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)

Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)

McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)

O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)

Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)

Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)

Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Clerk: Richardson, A.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, October 22, 1981

The committee met at 3:44 p.m. in room No. 228.

VISIT TO OTTAWA AND QUEBEC CITY

The Vice-Chairman: Unfortunately our chairman is sick in bed today. I got word about 20 minutes ago and he asked me to take the meeting. But discussion is supposed to take the form of what we viewed in Ottawa and what we viewed in Quebec at the National Assembly.

I do not know what thoughts he has or how he would like to prepare the report, so my suggestion is that we adjourn this meeting today and he can arrange another suitable time for a meeting and we can meet at that time.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I would concur. I think that of the people who went to Quebec City--there were 11 of us--I only see five here today out of the 11 who went on that trip. Certainly if we had the benefit of having the chairman--

The Vice-Chairman: We have six with us.

Mr. Boudria: We have six who were in Quebec?

The Vice-Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Boudria: In any case, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea to have the chairman of the committee here with us for this meeting.

The Vice-Chairman: I am further informed the report will be ready next week, so I would think that would be a more suitable time to have this meeting.

Mr. Boudria: Could I bring up one small point for the report if we are preparing a report on the trip to Quebec City? I do not know whether this is exact or not but I have been told by a member of our caucus that members of cabinet have charge facilities in the dining room here downstairs as they have in Ottawa and in Quebec City. I am just wondering if perhaps we could have those same facilities made available to members.

If the report is going to address that, that is fine. If it is not, I would like to suggest that the clerk ask the chairman during the preparation of the report what he would think of that idea. I think it would be very convenient for the members, especially when we bring large groups from our constituencies.

The Vice-Chairman: I think, Don, in all fairness, we should just report by reviewing what we saw, as is being prepared; you would have an opportunity after seeing and viewing that report

to bring in at our next meeting whatever recommendations or deletions you care to bring in.

Mr. Samis: Could I ask if we could have a report at the next meeting from Mr. Perry on the operations of the members' lounge? Could he provide us with some statistics as to usage?

The Vice-Chairman: You mean on the new one?

Mr. Samis: Yes.

Mr. Ruston: Where is this members' lounge anyway?

Mr. Samis: In the back of the dining room. I do not think anybody knows and I wonder how many people use it.

The Vice-Chairman: I want to get through the dining room door.

Mr. Ruston: In case I get thirsty I just wondered.

The Vice-Chairman: It is open there from two until six when the Legislature is sitting in the day. I do not know how long it is open at night time. However, that is a good idea and the clerk will look after that.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the Speaker sent a notice out about the new lounge facilities, and the time when they are available, on September 24 of this year.

Mr. Samis: I would still like to have some information from Mr. Perry so we can discuss that.

The Vice-Chairman: I will try to get this information for you. Anybody else?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I will wait until the next meeting. I was just wondering what took place about the physical facilities that were to be inserted in place of the lounge that was removed which I understood was to go to--

The Vice-Chairman: They have a small track around there. You have to go around 100 times to--

Mr. G. Taylor: I go around that track, Mr. Chairman, but we gave some instructions to Internal Economy and I assumed that they would be ready and physically available in October of this year, having worked over the summer. But I do not see them there so we might raise that at the next meeting.

The Vice-Chairman: Do you know what the matter is? The snow is steering George indoors.

Mr. Samis: --alone on this one.

The Vice-Chairman: A motion to adjourn would be proper. The chairman will call the next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

CA24N  
XC23  
-M27

M-6

Government  
Publications

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Clerk: Richardson, A.

Research Officer: O'Mara, J.

From the Office of the Legislative Assembly:  
Perry, C., Manager, Members' Food and Beverage Services

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, October 29, 1981

The committee met at 3:58 p.m. in room No. 228.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES;  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES  
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I draw your attention to today's agenda. Item one is a review of recommendations to the Board of Internal Economy. I had this matter placed on the agenda, and I would draw your attention to my letter as chairman of July 3, 1981, to the Speaker as the chairman of the Board of Internal Economy, dealing with the motions which were passed here just prior to that time.

I am sure you are aware, if not from the details, then from the results, that the Board of Internal Economy did deal with the first phase of our recommendation, which was that the members' lounge in the north wing be closed, et cetera. They dealt with the second part of that resolution that the assembly's manager of food and beverage services be requested to provide lounge facilities in the existing dining room, and so on.

They dealt with the third part dealing with a perpetual or permanent members' lounge facility, but they did not deal with the second part of that, which was, "The committee recommends that the Board of Internal Economy consider favourably the Ministry of Government Services' proposal for a fitness facility in the board room--" and so on.

There was Mr. G. W. Taylor's request some weeks later, after I was before the Board of Internal Economy. He asked me to determine what had become of that. It was my understanding, before the Board of Internal Economy, that they were not in receipt of that motion for some reason or other.

Mr. Boudria: It was on the same sheet.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I know. The board did not have my letter in context before it apparently. Let me finish and then I will tell you.

A report to Mr. Richardson, the clerk of the committee, from Mr. Michinson, who is the executive assistant to Mr. Fleming, indicates that on a motion by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. Gregory, the board agreed to accept the first and second recommendations by the members' services committee contained in my letter with these changes to take place October 1.

Mr. Michinson goes on to say that the board "did not deal with other recommendations of the committee contained in Mr. Robinson's letter." Armed with that information, I then approached the Speaker and asked him if he had before the Board of Internal

Economy the matter of the latter recommendation dealing with the fitness facility. He indicated to me at that time that he knew nothing about it whatsoever and no, it was not before the board.

I report that back to the committee for your information. If there is any direction to be coming forth again from that recommendation, we will have to decide whether or not we want to send it back directly to the Board of Internal Economy. Or you want to make some comment on it at this time.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Without being too nasty, it would appear that we have the same problem with people on staff as the Toronto Argonauts do. They cannot carry a message through. However, I would instruct the chairman to go back to the Board of Internal Economy with recommendation three. We have passed the time now when it should have been done and been in place had the Board of Internal Economy reviewed it and acted upon it as we had suggested earlier. It is unfortunate that this did not proceed further.

I assume that the Speaker will be commenting upon it to the staff who are responsible to him for failing to carry out the instructions of this committee. It is unfortunate. We had the same comments made in Ottawa that sometimes the staff do not heed the directions made by committees by motion. They seem to have the same problem in Ottawa. When members make decisions, recommendations or resolutions in committees, they are not carried out. I hope that we do not fall too greatly into that category in the future.

Mr. Chairman: I will accept that as a motion. Is there discussion to the motion?

Mr. Mancini: I came in at the tail end of your opening statement. I assume we are discussing the fact that our motion was not brought to the Board of Internal Economy in a complete form concerning the re-establishing of a new members' lounge.

Mr. Chairman: No. It was incomplete inasmuch as the recommendation dealing with the establishment of the fitness facility apparently was not brought before the board.

Mr. Mancini: What about the creation of a new members' lounge? I understand that this committee moved to close the old lounge and set up temporary headquarters in the dining room and that steps were to be taken immediately to try to locate a new lounge.

Mr. Chairman: That is correct. Let me quote it to you verbatim. Apparently the part that was before the Board of Internal Economy--I guess I should go back and give you a little bit more background.

I was called to appear before the Board of Internal Economy in the matter of my report of July 3. When I was physically before the board, they did not provide me with whatever information they had before them, so I was simply there. First, I was called upon to discuss the budget for the trip to Ottawa and Quebec. The

second item was the matter of the closing of the north wing lounge. That was the only specification I had for appearing.

It turned out later on that the matter of the lounge was not before them at all. However, they did approve the other three-part resolution, the third part of which reads: "Thirdly, that consideration of the suggestions made by the Ministry of Government Services with respect to a permanent members' lounge be postponed until the committee ascertains the usage of a members' lounge in the dining room, but that the committee reaffirms the principle that there shall always be a permanent or a members' lounge in this building." The Board of Internal Economy also endorsed that as a principle.

Mr. Mancini: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get away from your original discussions concerning the fact that staff did not bring to the attention of the Board of Internal Economy our feelings concerning a fitness centre area to be located here in the buildings, I would guess. I sat in the committee when we gave consideration to closing the members' lounge in the north wing. It is my understanding that the members agreed to close the lounge and have a temporary facility in the dining room. Attached to that agreement was that we would immediately start to search for a new, appropriate and permanent members' lounge.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. Mancini: There was nothing concerning how many people visited the dining room. I will not go to the dining room and sit at a dinner table and pretend I am in a lounge. I think most of the members said that. That was just a temporary facility. If a member had to go down there, at least he had some place to go.

Mr. Chairman: I do not mean to stop you from--

Mr. Rotenberg: Interjection.

4:10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Rotenberg. Mr. Mancini, I was going to draw to your attention that the second item on today's agenda is a report on the members' lounge facilities, on which, I am sure, Mr. Perry is going to take an active part. If we could perhaps deal with item number one, which is the matter of the fitness facility, and then move on to item two, it might be more appropriate at that time.

Mr. Rotenberg: I had two calls with the letter before us from the executive assistant. First, he says that the first and second recommendations were passed, when obviously the first, second and third recommendations were passed. It says "firstly, secondly, thirdly" and then there is a fourth one which is not numbered.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, and more important, when this matter was before the Board of Internal Economy, was not your letter to

the Speaker a part of the material before them on the agenda item? Because if it was then, with respect, I do not think in this case it would have been the staff's fault.

Mr. Chairman: Well, Mr. Rotenberg, as I said to the committee a few minutes ago, I was not provided with a copy of what the Board of Internal Economy had before it.

Mr. Rotenberg: What I am saying is there seems to be some criticism of staff not doing their job properly. In this case it may be that it was not the staff's fault, because if they had your letter, then all matters were before the board.

Mr. Chairman: As I also said, Mr. Rotenberg, in checking with the Speaker on receipt of Mr. Mitchinson's letter, he tells me that matter was not before the board.

Mr. Rotenberg: Was your letter before the board?

Mr. Chairman: I can only presume from his comment that if the matter was not, then the letter could not have been.

Mr. Rotenberg: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the whole letter may have been before the board and the board chose not to deal with it. So it may not be the staff's fault.

Mr. Chairman: In my remarks, Mr. Rotenberg, I did not direct criticism at anybody. I was simply reporting back to an inquiry from the committee as to the status of the item at this time.

Mr. Rotenberg: I was not referring to your remarks, Mr. Chairman. Other members of the committee suggested that maybe it was the staff's fault and I say in this case it might not have been.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Not the staff of this committee.

Mr. Rotenberg: Not the staff of this committee, staff somewhere. But it may not have been the fault of staff anywhere.

Mr. Samis: Maybe we should reconsider the agenda because I do not see how we can proceed with the motion without having a full discussion on the whole question of the members' lounge. To me it is intrinsic to the future of such a fitness facility based on the assumption we resolve the question of the members' lounge. Obviously there is a serious problem there, so I would make a motion that we make the members' lounge the first item of business, rather than Mr. Taylor's motion, so we can resolve that and then move back to the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any objections to that as a method of proceeding? Very well.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in the House this afternoon--

Mr. Chairman: Yes, so am I.

Mr. McLean: --and I will not be with you too long. I just had a couple of remarks I wanted to make before I left. The first one is the availability to the members of the lounge behind the council chambers. I find it very difficult to be able to talk to any members in there. On Tuesday, I counted 23 staff. It is part of members' services as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Boudria: You mean the lobby?

Mr. McLean: Yes, the lobby and behind. Every day after question period I would like to have a glass of apple juice and there is never any left. I think that the members of the Legislature should have some rights and I would think that that should be the members' lounge. There are other rooms in the building for staff.

Secondly, I think that new members elected to this Legislature, and every member in the House, should have the same as they have in Ottawa, a pin identifying them as a member of Parliament. This is something that you can probably bring up in another meeting. Those are the points that I wanted to mention.

Mr. Chairman: By way of comment from the chair, the matter of the lobby is something that exists more in the east lobby than the west lobby--I have not heard from our friends on the west side of the House--but if it is the wish of committee, we could direct a recommendation to the House leaders.

Mr. Samis: Why don't we defer that to a future meeting?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McLean, are you agreeable to having both these items reappear at a future date as soon as it is convenient?

Mr. McLean: Yes, sure.

Mr. Chairman: All right, we will do it that way then.

Mr. Mancini: Now that we have rearranged the agenda in order to deal with the members' lounge facility first, I would like to restate what I thought the committee was doing. I understood that the committee was closing the north wing lounge and setting up a purely temporary facility in the dining room, and that once this was done the staff, or somebody, would take steps to try to find a better and permanent location for the members' lounge. I hope that was the intention of the committee because that was why--

Mr. Chairman: Let's just back up for a minute. Mr. Perry, did you have a presentation to make on this agenda item? Was it your intention to make a presentation? You just want to answer questions? All right, carry on Mr. Mancini.

Mr. Mancini: It says in the motion--I guess we are talking about the paragraph that begins with "thirdly--only that

the committee reaffirms the principle that there shall always be a members' lounge in the building.

I do not want the dining room to become the permanent members' lounge. It also states here that the committee is going to get some figures on the usage of the members' lounge in the dining room. It was discussed here at great length that the majority of members were not going to make use of that lounge. I stated, myself, that this was just a temporary facility in case some members felt that they had to use it. If they had guests from out of town, at least they had some place to go.

I accept that particular paragraph except it does not really convey--maybe we could have made it longer and added some other sentences to it--it doesn't convey what I thought was the general opinion of the members; that it was a temporary facility and that we were going to take immediate steps to find a permanent lounge in a proper location. That is where I find that I am not in agreement with that paragraph, Mr. Chairman, and I was wondering if we could have some debate on that.

Mr. Samis: I want to speak to the question of the lounge. We have had it brought up in our caucus now in two consecutive meetings. The overwhelming consensus of our members is that the present temporary arrangement is highly unsatisfactory. Mr. Perry could contradict me but last Thursday I checked with some of the staff and asked how many people have used the facility since it opened. They said a grand total of three people had made use of the temporary lounge, which obviously conveys a message. It obviously does not look like a lounge; it is obviously not attractive. The location is unacceptable, and I think we have to do something about it.

Some of our members are regretting the closing of the old facility. Obviously the question raised to them was, "Why didn't you use it if you thought it was worthwhile?" Some of them are asking if there is any chance of reopening it if it were refurbished, or what can be done.

Remo and I have been taking a look at the cabinet dining room and lounge and thought that if we are looking for another facility in that area, that would certainly be far superior since there is an existing bar. There are two rooms, one which is already set up as a lounge and actually looks like a lounge, and the other part of the dining room could be very easily turned into some sort of a lounge with, if you want to segregate it, one for members only, the other for members and guests.

Mr. Chairman, a member of our caucus wrote me a letter and said he wanted it read into the record, so I will. It is from Bob Mackenzie and says:

"Dear Sirs:

"I am writing concerning the closing of the members' lounge facility in the basement of the north wing. I wish to inform the members' services committee that in a caucus meeting of the

elected members of the Ontario NDP, a resolution was passed protesting the closing. It is my feeling, personally, as well as the feeling of my colleagues in caucus, that although the facility was not used by a large number of the members, it was a real value for those of us who did use it.

"The change of location to the back part of the members' dining room will not, in our opinion, be any answer to the need. In any event, its use is much too restrictive. We all have visitors in from our ridings. I have on many occasions taken those people downstairs to the lounge for a drink or a coffee, and in many cases it has been necessary for my legislative assistant to take such people down to the lounge while I am temporarily tied up with meetings or in the House. It is our feeling it would be a positive move to reopen the lounge and I urge you to reconsider your decision and make this facility available to the members again."

I would like to ask Mr. Perry if he could give us some figures on the usage of the lounge since it has been open, and what his own views are as to why it is being almost totally ignored by the members of this House.

Mr. Chairman: Before you do that, Mr. Samis, I could make a comment on one of your earlier points. At the Board of Internal Economy, when I was there, Mr. Gregory gave his commitment to the Board of Internal Economy that he would inquire of cabinet whether or not they would be prepared to relinquish, either on a full-time or a part-time basis, their dining room facility. He was to report back to the Board of Internal Economy and I do not know to this point what the answer was. This is just to let you know that that was being proceeded with in another forum.

Mr. Perry: At the time you asked the question, Mr. Samis, you were quite right. It had been used by a total of about five people.

Mr. Samis: And one of them was a leadership candidate doing his campaign work.

4:20 p.m.

Mr. Perry: We are now up to a total of about 20 people who have used the lounge since the House came back into session, on probably no more than about seven occasions.

Mr. Samis: The general feeling in our caucus, Mr. Perry, is that the location is poor; it does not look like a lounge; the atmosphere is not conducive to relaxing and bringing anybody in. I would be interested in your own feelings as to why it is not being used.

Mr. Perry: Probably for some of the same reasons. The whole point is it was planned as a temporary measure until we were offered a permanent location.

Mr. Mancini: I am glad you said it was planned as a temporary measure because there seems to be some confusion about that.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think there is any confusion in Mr. Perry's mind.

Mr. Perry: I was never aware that it was going to be permanent. I recommended the ministers' dining room and, yes, I was at the Board of Internal Economy meeting when Mr. Gregory was asked to approach the ministers if that room could be used and up to now I have had no reply, so I do not know where we stand on that request. The other suggestion was that perhaps we could find another location in either the basement or the first floor level. Again, I have no control over this building or the rooms so I have to wait until somebody offers me a facility.

Mr. Samis: May I ask you, Mr. Perry, about the usage of the cabinet dining room and the cabinet lounge? Can you give us some indication of how frequently, first of all, the lounge is used and, secondly, the dining room?

Mr. Perry: The lounge is not used.

Mr. Samis: Virtually unused.

Mr. Perry: I can remember only two occasions when I have seen people sitting in there.

Mr. Samis: In what period of time would you say?

Mr. Perry: Three years.

Mr. Samis: Two occasions in three years.

Mr. Rotenberg: That is not the lounge; that is the entrance room.

Mr. Samis: Is that the room you have to go through to pass the bar?

Mr. Rotenberg: The entrance from the corridor.

Mr. Kerr: The phone is used a lot.

Mr. Perry: No, into the ministers' dining room, there is a small lounge with a telephone.

Mr. Rotenberg: The entry into the minister's dining room; that is an entrance hall, that is not really a lounge.

Mr. Perry: It is a little sitting room and it is never used, it really is not used. The dining room is used in the morning for breakfast meetings, both the exec room and--

Mr. Di Santo: Especially on Thursdays.

Mr. Perry: Especially on Thursdays, yes. The back room and the front room are both used, but the use of the dining room itself varies a lot.

Mr. Samis: Could it be arranged fairly easily that those cabinet dining meetings could be held in the back room which is now designated as a temporary members' lounge, considering the numbers of people using it?

Mr. Perry: Sometimes they are. If we have a large meeting of over 20 people, room three is an area we have to use. On occasions in the mornings for breakfasts we do use both the exec dining room and the cabinet dining room, and also that alcove room for meetings.

Mr. Samis: Would you regard it as feasible, if we were to get the cabinet dining room as a lounge area, that the back room could be designated for them and generally adequately serve their purposes?

Mr. Perry: Where I am running into problems is dining facilities for meetings and really the answer is no.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Chairman, before we get too far along into this discussion about the cabinet room, I want to inform the members of the committee that several members of the Liberal caucus have approached me to ask the members' services committee if room 228, the room in which we are meeting now, could be turned into a members' lounge and a dining room. I am told that originally--and maybe George would know because he has been here a lot longer than some of us--this facility was used as the members' dining room--

Mr. Kerr: No, we are sitting in the members' dining room, here and the other room--

Mr. Mancini: Okay, that is confirmed that at one time this was a dining room. So the members of the Liberal caucus have asked me to ask the members' services committee if we could turn one of these rooms into a lounge and the other into a dining room and therefore reclaim the section that was once used by the members. They especially wanted me to mention that this facility is on the second floor, it is more or less adequately decorated and there are windows and curtains and wallpaper and some of the amenities, so they thought it would be quite nice.

So before we get too far along and too involved in discussing the cabinet room, they also want us to take into consideration room 228.

Mr. Chairman: I would advise you, Mr. Mancini, that rooms 228 and 230 are apparently controlled by the PC caucus and any request would have to go directly there.

Mr. Mancini: Would the committee be willing to write to the chairman of the PC caucus?

Mr. Kerr: We need this as a committee room.

Mr. Mancini: You can always use it. If the PC caucus want to have a special night here, I am sure there would be no problems.

Mr. Kerr: We would have to take these desks out.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, could I interrupt again for a minute? Mr. Richardson corrects something that I have said and I do not want to ever be accused of having misled this committee particularly. Apparently room 228 is under the control of the Clerk of the House as a committee room. Room 230 next door is under the control of the PC caucus.

Mr. Mancini: I suggest that we write to the Clerk of the House and to the chairman of the PC caucus, expressing to them why we would like control of these rooms to see what their reaction is. I think we should try that route before we try to go back into the basement. Frankly, I do not know how much success we are going to have in trying to get the facilities there.

Mr. Chairman: If I could interrupt again, we are starting to stack things one on top of another, although you are now on a sort of tangent to Mr. Samis' original line. Mr. Perry, do you want to comment on the feasibility, from your standpoint, of using these two rooms?

Mr. Perry: Before we start extending the services, one of the areas that we cannot extend, I have been told, because of the brick walls, et cetera, is my kitchen facilities and my storage and refrigeration facilities, which are completely crammed with the facilities I am offering now.

Mr. Mancini: Build a new kitchen here.

Mr. Perry: If we make a new kitchen up here, with storage and refrigeration equipment, yes, I could make this into a dining room, but then I would need more staff.

Mr. Hodgson: We used to have a little kitchen in there, six by eight.

Mr. Kerr: Get a hotplate or something; somewhere to plug in a kettle.

Mr. Chairman: Just so we know what we are talking about, if you want to talk in terms of using these rooms, and that is something the committee can decide at its pleasure to pursue or not, we are into a heavy, heavy price tag to do any sort of conversion and build kitchens if we wish to use them. I do not have any prejudice on it one way or the other, but let us recognize the scope of what we are dealing with if we get into the use of these rooms.

Mr. Samis: I just ask, especially the PC members, if there is the same widespread discontent with the present temporary facility, because in our caucus it is almost unanimous.

Mr. Chairman: I can tell you that I, as chairman, have heard nothing from our members. I have heard from your members.

Mr. Samis: Your members obviously do not use it then.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: No, we did not use either one, generally.

Mr. Samis: So you have got your special arrangement there.

Mr. Mancini: You have Bud Gregory's office, you have a little anteroom there with a TV and I notice you have a bar. It is under lock and key, of course, to keep control of the situation. But you have some type of thing--

Mr. Hodgson: You have room to have the same type of thing in your place if you wanted, the Liberals.

Mr. Mancini: No, we have not.

Mr. Hodgson: Yes, you have, you have got a big room there.

Mr. Mancini: No, we do not.

Mr. Hodgson: Where is your caucus room?

Mr. Kerr: Eddie Sargent's office.

Mr. Hodgson: I have been to parties in that room and there was a hell of a lot more than--

Mr. Samis: Could I ask Mr. Perry a very simple question? Where does one get a Coke in this building?

Mr. Perry: In the cafeteria or the press gallery lounge .

Mr. Samis: There is no place in the north wing whatsoever where anybody can get a soft drink, right?

Mr. Perry: That is correct.

Mr. Samis: Then if the dining room happens to be closed, they are totally dependent on the press gallery.

Mr. Perry: Right.

Mr. Samis: Which some of our staff feel rather strongly is totally inadequate and I would like to bring it to your attention.

Mr. Chairman: You say the press gallery is inadequate?

Mr. Samis: If that is the only facility where somebody can get a soft drink other than the dining room. My point is, if there is a general dissatisfaction with the existing facility, what are the steps to try to move towards another facility?

Mr. Chairman: That is the matter that is probably before us today and an hour later we have not got to the point.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: (Inaudible) this is a temporary facility that is going to be a little more permanent.

Mr. Mancini: What do you mean, a little more permanent?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Samis and the people who are using it do not want to go there, obviously, because it is not what it is supposed to be; it does not look like a lounge; it does not act like a lounge; it is not a lounge; but our intention was to make it look more like a lounge on a temporary basis.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Samis: Nothing has been changed.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Nothing has been changed so it has not even got to the initial experimental basis.

Mr. Samis: Surely they have had time to make the changes. Nothing has been changed.

Mr. Perry: I am not quite sure. I am not quite clear what was in people's minds. I do not have the staff to take out all the dining room tables and all the dining room chairs in the afternoons and put in chesterfields and small chairs. I have nowhere to store these things even if I had staff. So, I am not quite clear.

Mr. Samis: You do admit, Mr. Perry, it is not a lounge right now. It is a dining room.

Mr. Perry: Certainly. My impression is it was never intended to be a permanent location anyway.

Mr. Samis: Yes. But we are saying it is not even a lounge on a temporary basis.

Mr. G. M. Taylor: No similarity to a temporary lounge.

Mr. Samis: No. So we are back to square one.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Who wants to be next?

Mr. Mancini: I would just like to know from the members of the PC caucus and from George and Odoardo what their feelings are about asking the PC caucus and the Clerk of the House if we could obtain room 228 and 230 since they were, at one time, used for the members, and see if they could once again be turned over for the use of the members. That matter should be discussed somewhat.

The Vice-Chairman: The way I see it, Remo, as far as this room is concerned, we have always been short of committee rooms around here, even yet. This is set up to look like an ideal committee room. We went to great expense to get recording in here,

Hansard and all these phones. But as far as the other room is concerned, it is a question you would have to put to the PC caucus.

Mr. Samis: Can I ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the room next door used for by the PC caucus?

The Vice-Chairman: I have attended a couple of receptions in the last couple of years there, and that is about all.

Mr. Samis: Is that what it is used for, a reception room?

The Vice-Chairman: Yes. At one time, when it was first set up, it was for a ministers' room for the ministers to come over here. There were three or four telephones in it at that time and they would come in here. Rather than having a sessional office, they used this room.

Mr. Samis: But you are saying no longer.

The Vice-Chairman: Not an office; just a telephone, and movable partitions.

Mr. Samis: My point is, does the average back-bencher use it now, or is it just used by the occasional fleeting cabinet minister?

Mr. Kerr: Usually just for special occasions. What they did was take all the furniture out of our caucus room. The caucus room just has tables and chairs now, because too many people were going to sleep during caucus meetings I guess. Make sure that is not on the record. But most of that furniture is in that room now. We use that really for receptions and things like that and a caucus member can use it if he wants to get the key for it. It is pretty well permanently locked.

The Vice-Chairman: When they refer to it as a government room--have you never been at a reception there?

Mr. Samis: Yes, I have. But I did not realize until today it was under PC control.

Mr. Chairman: That is the first I knew of it. Somebody has control over it, but the first I heard about it is today. I thought it was a reception room.

Mr. Samis: So I come back to my point of what the PC members want in terms of a lounge. What do the PC members say they want in terms of a lounge? Do they say anything?

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, when we moved to the temporary quarters, I thought there was some discussion of probably changing the barber's shop and remodelling that area so we could have strictly a members' lounge as they have in Ottawa and leave the ministers' dining room as it is, be able to serve the lounge from the present bar down in that area.

Mr. Samis: But that has not happened down there.

Mr. McLean: No. But I think that is what we should be looking at, how that could be done, and then you would have the same bartenders. I think what we were looking at was to cut the cost and make an area there. I think that is an ideal location. If you want a bite to eat, fine; if you want to go into the bar, you can get there through the lounge.

The Vice-Chairman: Furthermore, on top of that I am pretty enthused about extending this building to the north and building proper facilities for all those things at the north end and give our members proper accommodation.

Mr. McLean: A new building, you mean.

The Vice-Chairman: That is a little piece away, but maybe something like this would suffice until that is built.

Mr. Samis: Something like what would suffice?

The Vice-Chairman: You were in here. The Ministry of Government Services presented a plan in here for underground parking and--

Mr. Samis: We are dealing with the here and now. People are dissatisfied with this interim arrangement.

The Vice-Chairman: They were dissatisfied with the arrangements at the north wing.

Mr. Samis: Let me put the position of the people in my caucus. They feel the present arrangement is even worse; we have gone a step backwards.

The Vice-Chairman: They have not torn that building at the north end down yet. There is still that room vacant. Maybe we should move it back.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, I think this committee should have a tour of this building and find out where all of the facilities are, find out what is in that room next door, find out what is downstairs. There are probably rooms in here. We have never even seen the kitchen and we should know the facilities there and know that it is to its capacity.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Chairman, some of us did that. Did you not have three of us or six of us?

Mr. Perry: You did a tour of the kitchen facilities and the dining area and the basement level where the barber's shop is, that idea. But that is all. There is a lot of other--I have never been on a tour of all the rooms in this building. I have been through the committee rooms, yes. As to what is available or what could be available--

Mr. McLean: Maybe the fifth floor has all kinds of room.

Mr. Di Santo: Yes. That is a good idea, Mr. Chairman, provided we do that quite quickly.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Kerr moves that the committee tour the legislative building completely one week from today.

That is a good suggestion because we have toured all Ottawa and we toured (inaudible) but we have not toured our own building.

Mr. McLean: I would agree with that if it could be set two weeks from today.

Mr. Kerr: All right.

Mr. Samis: May I ask, Mr. Perry, if the general feeling of the committee after the tour was that until we can find something, get somebody to give us the space for something, the previous lounge should be reopened as an interim measure until we get this permanent facility, how much would be involved in that process?

Mr. Perry: Just hiring staff and restocking it.

Mr. Samis: That is all.

The Vice-Chairman: There would be no furniture to be moved out or anything?

Mr. Kerr: What about the big room adjoining which was used as a committee room or a lounge? There was a separate room next to the lounge area.

Mr. Samis: That is our caucus room now.

Mr. Kerr: That is your caucus area now. I see.

Mr. Di Santo: We would like to give it up if you give us your caucus room.

Mr. Kerr: You could give up about three quarters of that room, could you not?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes, if you give us one quarter of your caucus room.

Mr. Samis: Let us say there is room for (inaudible)--

Mr. Kerr: No. You cannot have that caucus room. Good heavens. Oh, no. That is sort of front and centre.

Mr. Samis: May I ask, if we are waiting two weeks so everybody does a tour of the building, is anything going to be changed in the so-called interim facility?

Mr. Perry: I do not know where to change. Physically I just do not have the space.

Mr. Samis: If there is no flexibility in that arrangement, Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to make a motion that we reopen the previous lounge until we find another facility.

The Vice-Chairman: Can you hang on for two weeks until we have the tour of the building?

Mr. Samis: Yes. I can hang on until then.

The Vice-Chairman: Then present your motion. Any more business? Any more questions of Mr. Perry?

The committee adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

CA24N  
XC23  
-M27

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES  
REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Clerk: Richardson, A.

Research Officer: O'Mara, J.

From the Office of the Legislative Assembly:  
Perry, C., Manager, Members' Food and Beverage Services

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, November 19, 1981

The committee met at 4:03 p.m. in room No. 228.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES: REORGANIZATION OF MEMBERS' FACILITIES  
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I asked that we hold agenda item number one, which we are still holding, in favour of item number two, if you will recall the last agenda out. Members will also recall that last week we toured this building pretty well from top to bottom, and that the only space we found that might at all be suitable for a lounge facility was, what is affectionately known as the janitor's boardroom, east of the cafeteria--is it east or north?

Mr. Boudria: Some of us found another room, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: West of the cafeteria. I get turned around down there.

I have spoken with the minister, the Honourable Douglas Wiseman, about that particular space. He is prepared to come back to this committee in one or two week's time, at your pleasure, with a detailed report outlining how it may be utilized. I have also spoken with Mr. Perry, on the committee's behalf, briefly about it, and I would invite him to make comment at this time, if that is your wish.

Interjection: Agreed.

Mr. Mancini: Okay. Let us have the goods. Let us talk about the scallops.

Mr. Perry: With the exception of the ministers' dining room, which was the other alternative, the room you have chosen is probably the most convenient for all members. It is close to the elevators and it is in the correct wing of the building for us to service it properly. It should not cost that much to furnish it for a members' lounge.

Interjection: Which room is it?

Mr. Perry: I think it is E-29.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. O'Mara, do you know the number? B-29?

Mr. Perry: B-29. I believe you were also looking at one of the office spaces there to combine with that room, which would make a perfect television room.

Mr. Chairman: At this time--I am sorry, Mr. Perry. Did you have further comments?

Mr. Perry: No. Just about the office space at the back, where you could knock the wall through.

Mr. Chairman: I want to draw the committee's attention that in speaking with the minister about the report he brings in-- Do you have Dr. O'Mara's floor plans from a couple of weeks ago?

Mr. Mancini: What page is that?

Mr. Chairman: I do not know. It says "basement floor plan."

Interjection: We have got it.

Mr. Chairman: Have you got it? All right. If you look at room B-29, there is then below it B-29E. That is specifically the space that the minister is looking at at this time, and he gives me some assurance of being able to turn it over for our use.

B-29D, which is the office--have you got this, Mr. Perry?

4:10 p.m.

Mr. Perry: No. But I know the area.

Mr. Chairman: All right. B-29D, immediately below that, as it is on this sheet, is the other private office that ultimately might be used for a TV lounge, but unless we direct him specifically to look at both propositions at this time, he is likely to come back with that B-29E and a plan for furnishing and redecorating or reconstituting that area.

Mr. Mancini: What is the best room, in your opinion, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: What is the best room, in my opinion?

Mr. Mancini: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman: In my humble opinion, respectful opinion, at this time, the best room for a lounge is B-29E.

Mr. Mancini: Why do we not just decide to take B-29E then?

Mr. Chairman: As I say, I just want to advise you of my discussions with the minister on your behalf.

Mr. Mancini: Do we need a motion from this committee, or something, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I would be pleased if someone would offer a motion inviting the minister to attend the next meeting of committee with a plan dealing with the redevelopment of that.

Interjection: What is the matter, George?

Mr. Mancini: George is concerned.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I am getting nervous. Besides taking it, and I know what it used for in the evening--for those meetings now, what alternative are they going to have in the evening? We are now suggesting taking away from B-29E a room that, I guess--

Interjection: It is a meeting room.

Mr. Perry: It is just a boardroom.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Do they not use it sort of a rest place in the evening?

Mr. Perry: No. They do not use any of that area.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: You know downstairs--if you take this corner and go down into the corner, you see the guys pulling out soda pop and that. There is a hallway, right in the very corner of this section down here. You have to go back up. In the evening all the cleaning ladies are up in that area.

Mr. Samis: (Inaudible) to report. Do you know?

Mr. Perry: No. I do not. You see, there are two offices down there. They are very large ones. There is the boardroom. There is a restroom for the guides. That is also a ladies' lounge there. That is the whole of that complex. It starts off at B-29L, which, I believe, is the guides' room, and then B-29D, which is the ladies' staff room, B-29C is an office, B-29D is an office, and B-29E is the meeting room.

Mr. Boudria: Can we proceed with the motion?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: (Inaudible) It is a small room, is what I said and my colleagues there have also said the same thing.

Mr. Boudria: Is it too small, George?

Interjection.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: If you have got a party of one, yes--

Mr. Chairman: I understand it is probably 20 by 15.

Mr. Samis: That is pretty small, almost puny. In terms of the existing lounge, it would be what, about one-eighth the size, one-sixth the size, approximately?

Mr. Mancini: Let us take a vote.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: If I can redirect that question to Dr. O'Mara, who has worked up a report on it, and I believe it was left to me to distribute--I think I have got it in my office--and it has been sent out. I apologize if you have not received it.

Okay. You do have it. Perhaps you could go over what the various spaces are for the committee in that area.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Are these drawn to scale?

Interjections.

Interjection: Same old gang. Yes.

Dr. O'Mara: On the diagram that is attached to the report, number 22 refers to the tour guides' room. On this diagram here--

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Hold it up. Has everybody got this report?

Interjections.

Dr. O'Mara: It is labelled 22 on this particular diagram.

Mr. Chairman: It is 29A.

Dr. O'Mara: That is the tour guides' room.

Mr. Mancini: How big is that?

Dr. O'Mara: I have the measurements of the entire area not the individual rooms, because I assumed it was the whole area you were interested in.

Mr. Chairman: Let's go down the list: we have the guides and then we have the cleaning ladies. Then 29C is an office.

Dr. O'Mara: General services office, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Then 29D is now an office.

Dr. O'Mara: That's correct; that is the trades office. The long room that adjoins the cafeteria is a meeting room. It has a door into the corridor, the other offices or other spaces, and a door into the cafeteria. The last room that is technically in that area is a telephone switching room and a store room.

Mr. Chairman: Which is listed as 29B at the top of that. You can see all the bearing walls that are around that as well.

Mr. Boudria: I don't think there is any use talking about that one.

Mr. Chairman: I am just identifying it for you.

If you put 29E and 29D together, which is the board room and the one office, those of us who were on the tour near the end discussed at that point using 29E as a general lounge facility, small as it may be; and using 29D as a separate lounge facility with a television in it. We have a television from the north lounge which could be used in there. If we wanted to, we could put an archway or a doorway through between the two rooms. There is not too much of a structural problem there.

Mr. Samis: But we have no figures, no dimensions.

Mr. Chairman: I can tell you that 29E is 15 by 20. If this drawing is to scale, I would suggest the other room looks to be about 15 by 15.

Mr. McLean: How many here went on that tour?

Mr. Chairman: How many here saw the room? Is it the wish of the committee that we go and look at the room right now?

Mr. Boudria: While we down there--and I am just opening this up for discussion now--I do not think two of those rooms are big enough to make a lounge of any size. I know this is going to present big problems, but could we look at the possibility of having 29B, C, D and E? There would be a door so that those two first offices would be used for whatever it is they are used for now; and we would use four of those rooms to have a decent-sized lounge--that kind of an idea. Do you follow what I mean?

Mr. Chairman: What you are saying is that you do not want to use 29, which is the telephone switching room--

Mr. Boudria: Nor 29A.

Mr. Chairman: Which is the guides' room.

Mr. Boudria: So we would only be using four rooms as opposed to using that whole wing. I think those four rooms in size would be big enough and it would not be quite as big a burden trying to relocate the staff, because the change rooms for those ladies is 29A, as I understand it.

Mr. O'Neil: Is there any structural problem if we did that?

Mr. Boudria: Not with those four, I don't think. Those are only partitions.

Mr. Chairman: They are not bearing walls, are they Colin?

Mr. Perry: I do not believe so.

Mr. McLean: Has anybody determined the size that we should have? If you are only going to have three, four or five people in there most of the time, why do you need--

Mr. Samis: Who says you are going to have three, four or five?

Mr. McLean: Well, from past experience--

Mr. Chairman: Why don't we go have a look?

The committee recessed at 4:20 p.m. and resumed at 4:27 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. Chairman: Okay, can we reassemble here? Now we have

seen what we are talking about. Is there any discussion of how we should proceed to find a lounge space from this point?

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Kerr mentioned that he was interested in room 230. You may recall that two or three weeks ago I mentioned to the committee that the Liberal caucus had asked me to bring up in this committee whether or not we would have an opportunity to obtain that room as a member's lounge. At that time it was suggested that room 230 is under the auspices of the Progressive Conservative Party. I was not aware of that at the time. But between then and now I have had a chance to run into the PC whip--

Mr. Chairman: With your car.

Mr. Mancini: With my car, but unfortunately he was not running--I was just joking. The whip suggested that room 230 would not be available.

If there are members of the PC Party who feel that room 230 would be available, then I think we should make that our first choice and what we have downstairs our second choice, and get going on this thing. Either we get 230 or not, and if we do not we go right downstairs.

Mr. Chairman: How much of downstairs are you proposing?

Mr. Mancini: B-29E and B-29D I believe were the ones that had the windows.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Samis: C would be better.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest, with respect, you have to keep the area together.

Mr. Samis: I would suggest C and D.

Mr. Chairman: The two on the bottom, George. That would give Mr. Perry some servicing difficulties.

Mr. Samis: Yes, but it would also give us more area.

Mr. Chairman: I am here at your wish.

Mr. Mancini: One of those rooms looked quite big.

Mr. Samis: C was the largest one there

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: I am here at your wish.

Mr. Samis: C was the largest one there. C is the office, the largest one.

Mr. Perry: C, in the corner, is the office.

Mr. Mancini: Which one had all the windows, Mr. Perry?

Mr. Perry: C.

Mr. Mancini: Oh, I see. Okay, I am sorry. We can take B and C, then, if we cannot have room 230.

Mr. Chairman: You would take B and C, the cleaning ladies and that outside office? The motion is that this committee inquire of the government caucus whether or not they are prepared to relinquish control of room 230 for use as a members' lounge. Failing that--

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Mancini, this is your motion. What if there could be some arrangement whereby it could be used by the Tory caucus for the purpose that it is now being used for, that is for certain types of receptions, exclusively, from time to time? It does not happen frequently.

Mr. Mancini: I would concur with that.

Mr. Samis: You have to get it established, George, that it is the members' lounge. That has to be the primary purpose; then you can add that secondary purpose. But the primary use has to be as a members' lounge.

Mr. O'Neil: Is it not the understanding that the room has been used not only by the Tory caucus for those occasions but also by other groups, too? I do not think we should narrow it down only to the PCs. I think it should be available for the others to use as well.

Mr. Kerr: All right. The motion could say that from time to time the respective caucuses can use the room, upon reasonable notice, for a specific purpose or reception to the exclusion of other members.

Mr. Chairman: Can we just slow down a little bit here? Mr. Taylor?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: I understood that one of the reasons for the motion to close down the north wing members' lounge was the enormous cost of paying two individuals to sit there from morning until night just to serve a few people. That was where the saving was to come in. The furniture and equipment is there. The other assets that are there cost us no money, but we have made no money out of it to offset the heavy expenditures that were incurred as a result of having the two people there.

Is it the intention of the committee, having created a new lounge, be it B-29 or here, that we then secure two people to pass out a Coke from time to time, mixed with something else from time to time, and a little sandwich from time to time, adding that cost to the heavy deficit we are at present running? If that is the route, we really will have done nothing but play chess and checkers about the building and have disturbed some employees. We

might just as well go back to where it is at present if those bodies are just going to be relocatated.

Mr. Chairman: Let me put a very specific question to Mr. Perry. Mr. Perry, how would you staff room 230 if you had it? How would you staff rooms B-29B and C if you had them, and how would you staff room B-29E or E and/or D?

Mr. Perry: I would hire or rehire the steward I did not replace.

Mr. Chairman: Under all circumstances?

Mr. Perry: Under all circumstances, yes; if the members require the room to be serviced for the times they were previously serviced, which was from 8:30 in the morning until 5 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. Chairman: So we are going to rehire two stewards?

Mr. Perry: I would only hire one. However, I feel that there are two other things to look at. Is it going to be exclusively for members? The complaints I am getting now are mostly from staff, that they have nowhere to go for a drink. They used to use the north wing, as you are aware.

The other point is if it is in one of these locations, I feel the members probably would use this a lot more than they used to use the north wing.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Samis: You feel whatever location, whatever format, still one person would be (inaudible). So that would reduce part of the concern you have, George, about the previous operation.

Second, I think there was a legitimate general dissatisfaction; the previous location was unsatisfactory per se. That is a problem we have to deal with. We now have two options that most people agree represent improvements purely on the question of location. I see that as a step forward.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Is there any further discussion?

Mr. McLean: We have certainly gone around the loop on this. From what I observe now, you hire one person, use the boardroom down there--

Mr. Chairman: That's 29E.

Mr. McLean: Right, with one person. I think that would probably solve our problem.

There is no way we are going to get in probably next door. If we go back down where we were before--

Interjection.

Mr. McLean: I just offer my comments on it. Whether you want to go ahead or not, that's fine.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we finish up the motion.

Mr. Chairman: That is what I was trying to get to now. Mr. Mancini's motion is in two parts. The first deals with an official request of the PC caucus to relinquish control of room 230 for a members' lounge and that in the event of a negative response to that inquiry, the Ministry of Government Services be approached to relinquish control and to redevelop rooms B-29B and B-29C for use as a members' lounge, hand in hand with Mr. Perry's information that in any event one additional steward would have to be hired or rehired or added to the establishment of strength.

Just before I put the question, I would like to inquire of Mr. Mancini, the mover of the motion, whether or not we will hold off on Government Services doing anything at all until we have a response back from the PC caucus. Or do you want to try to do them simultaneously?

Mr. Di Santo: No, we should wait.

Mr. Samis: When would you decide that? Would you have to wait till next week for the regular caucus meeting for it to be brought up?

Mr. Chairman: I will have the request out as soon as Mr. Richardson has it prepared. I would think that realistically it is going to be a week before we know.

Mr. Mancini: Okay, I think we should wait.

Mr. Chairman: All right. I will take the motion on the basis that we will proceed with the first part, which is the request regarding room 230. We will hold here in this committee the second part until we have a response.

Mr. Samis: Can I just ask, what is involved in holding? Why cannot we proceed? What are you asking in terms of the second one?

Mr. Chairman: They will have to do a proposition to know whether they can move those offices conveniently somewhere else, whether or not they are willing in the first instance to give up that particular space, what the cost of renovation is going to be, what the construction type is down there, how much to furnish. Those are the things we need to know before we can make any kind of recommendation.

There are some considerable man-hours involved, I would assume, in putting that kind of presentation together, as there was when they were before us late in the spring with a proposition dealing with the fitness facility.

Mr. Samis: Okay, that's reasonable.

Mr. Mancini: So I assume if the answer from the PC caucus is no, that you will immediately and automatically approach MGS.

Mr. Chairman: We will report back the result of the inquiry next week or as soon as it is available. As soon as we have that, we will then proceed to the other.

Those in favour of the motion in two parts? Opposed, if any?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Item one on the agenda, the review of recommendations to the Board of Internal Economy. As you will recall, that still dealt with the matter of redevelopment of the former north wing lounge space. The main proposition of that was a fitness facility. It had been my hope that we could have moved that recommendation on, but you will recall that it was held here at committee again until the matter of the lounge was disposed of. Is it still the wish of committee that we hold that recommendation here?

Mr. Mancini: No, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we proceed with a special motion concerning that room in the north wing for the fitness facility.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini moves that this committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy that they undertake to make a survey of what it would entail to turn that room in the north wing into a fitness facility and what length of time it would take and have that information reported back to the members' services committee, to deal with it.

It seems to me that we had that information and passed it on to the Board of Internal Economy and they have not to this point, for one reason or another, considered that recommendation. The recommendation was subsequently withdrawn by this committee, pending disposition of the lounge matter.

Mr. Mancini: If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, I would make another motion.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mancini moves that the Board of Internal Economy use the information that has been provided to them, and undertake to refurbish that room in order that it be made into a fitness facility for the members of the Legislature.

Mr. Mancini is asking, in fact, that they favourably consider the resolution and recommendation that we previously presented.

Mr. Mancini: Right.

Mr. Samis: I am a little reluctant about proceeding until we get this damned thing settled. We are still not sure we would have either one of the options presented. We may get turned

down flat on both, which means that the only temporary option is getting back to the old lounge. I would be against the motion until we get final word on both the propositions.

Interjection.

Mr. Samis: I would be prepared to support it within two weeks; but I want to get word back on this place and downstairs first.

Mr. Chairman: Should we continue to hold the item and return to it in two weeks?

Mr. Mancini: We have to work together here, so let us just wait until everybody is ready.

Mr. Chairman: Further discussion?

All right. We shall hold that and return to that. We shall continue to return to those two items in tandem then.

You may be aware, and you may have in your possession from some weeks ago, the report, by way of information and compilation and summary, of our two acting committee clerks on the trip to Ottawa and Quebec City. That is before us.

We also have before us a request from Mr. Swart, the member for Welland-Thorold, dealing with the matter of the installation of speakers carrying the debate in the Legislature into the individual members' offices.

Interjections.

Mr. G. W. Taylor: (Inaudible). Usually, there are rules in most committees that when it is dealt with once in a session it is not brought in again.

Interjection: What was the result from last time?

Mr. Chairman: The clerk just reminds me, and my memory was somewhat faulty on it, that when it was here last it was the decision of the committee that the individuals would take it to their caucuses for consensus and bring consensus back here.

To the best of my knowledge, no one has done that, except perhaps the NDP caucus. Mr. Samis, Mr. Di Santo: did Mr. Swart caucus this matter?

Mr. Samis: Not on this request. Last spring he did, but not on this one.

Mr. Chairman: The same request was made then. There was negative consensus among the three caucuses; at least I do not know about yours. So this was in fact another kick at the cat.

What is the wish of the committee?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: Spare the cat.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McLean moves to oppose the recommendation for the request.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The only other matter outstanding, then, is the lengthy report.

Mr. Mancini: I have new business.

Mr. Chairman: Could I recommend, now that we have made some progress on the other two items, that we establish next week's meeting as the time and place and date that we shall consider in detail the report of the trip to Ottawa and Quebec, and we shall have Mr. White, Mr. Arnott and Mr. Perry, and the Sergeant-at-Arms, if available. Is that the wish of committee?

Agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: We shall put that on for next week then.

Mr. Mancini has new business.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee may be aware that the cabinet ministers have the privilege of charging their meals when they eat in the members' dining lounge.

I have been conferring with Mr. Speaker, and also through his executive assistant to Mr. Speaker. I was informed by Mr. Speaker's executive assistant that they would look favourably on a motion in the Board of Internal Economy which would allow all members that privilege.

What basically they were interested in, if the members' services committee would support it, would be that members would be allowed to sign for their meals and at the end of the month they would be billed and they would have 10 days to pay their bill.

Mr. Kerr: Or what?

Mr. Mancini: Probably their privileges would be cut off, or the office of the administration would start hounding them, or something would happen.

But anyway, that is the procedure that--

Mr. Kerr: It goes on the bulletin board.

Mr. Mancini: Yes, it goes on the bulletin board, and it goes up to the (inaudible).

Interjections.

Mr. McLean: I should like to ask Mr. Perry, Mr. Chairman, if that would create any problems for him.

Mr. Perry: As long as I hire somebody else. I would need an additional part-time person to process all these signed

invoices. At the present time I have 45 different accounts, which are cabinet ministers, caucuses, et cetera. Depending on the day, we can spend anywhere from 20 to 45 minutes collating these on separate sheets, and it takes two of my staff between two and three hours at the end of the month totalling them.

Mr. Mancini: You are assuming, Mr. Perry, that all 125 members will eagerly use the service every day. I am not assuming that.

Mr. Perry: No, not every day. Cabinet ministers do not use it every day, but you have to keep separate sheets to collate every billing they have until the end of the month.

Mr. McLean: I fail to see the reason that you have to hire more staff. Could not your cashier, your hostess, do it? A lot of times, they do not appear to be busy. Could they not do this in their spare time?

Interjections.

Mr. Perry: The cashier is already doing it, early in the morning, now, between answering the telephone, she and the hostess.

Mr. O'Neil: I do not really agree with Mr. Mancini. I think the present system is such that the members should be paying for their meals as they buy them.

I think it would create problems, not only for Mr. Perry's staff but for members keeping track of what they owe and writing cheques and paying for it. The present system is, in my view, satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman: Let me suggest something in the alternative, something Mr. Perry and I have discussed. It is a proposition that would allow for the acceptance of Chargex or Visa--in a very discreet way and not broadly advertised--one or two of the major credit cards as a method of payment.

Mr. Samis: Would you be able to confine that in numbers?

Mr. Chairman: No. I suppose it really does not matter. It is just the business of accepting a credit card.

Mr. Samis: You are saying for virtually anybody who uses it, then?

Mr. G. W. Taylor: The difficulty is that there is in theory a user fee. Previously, though, most if not all government operations refused to engage in the use of credit cards because they exact a percentage of the take. That is one of the reasons for it. You might run afoul of some strange little Manual of Administration policy somewhere.

Mr. Chairman: In the light of its being under new business, would it be appropriate to recommend at this time that Mr. Perry take those suggestions and report back on their feasibility for the next meeting?



CAZ&N  
XC 23  
- M 27

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES  
REVIEW OF VISIT TO OTTAWA AND QUEBEC CITY  
MEMBERS' DINING ROOM  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1981

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN: Hodgson, W. (York North PC)  
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)  
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)  
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)  
McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)  
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)  
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)  
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)  
Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)  
Taylor, G. W. (Simcoe Centre PC)  
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Clerk: White, G.

Researcher: O'Mara, Dr. J.

From the Office of the Speaker:  
Stelling, T., Sergeant at Arms

From the Office of the Director of Administration:  
Beech, Ms. B., Supervisor, Members' Dining Room

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Thursday, December 10, 1981

The committee met at 3:57 p.m. in room No. 228.

REVIEW OF VISIT TO OTTAWA AND QUEBEC CITY

Mr. Chairman: I see a quorum. I would draw everyone's attention to the report. I hope everyone brought a copy of the report with him, though it is somewhat ancient at this time, and we will go through it section by section. If anyone has any additional comments to make or requires further clarification from the acting clerk--

An hon. member: I didn't bring a copy of the report, Mr. Chairman. I would like a copy.

Mr. Chairman: We need three copies.

Clerk of the Committee: Because of the confidentiality of this material, I didn't bring extra copies. There were just enough for each member.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. They can share. The first section deals with the House of Commons in Ottawa and the matter of the library of Parliament. What I would do is ask if anyone has any recommendations or comments for consideration to use here, that he make them as we go through the sections. Anything on the library? Going, going, gone.

Anything on English Hansard in Ottawa? Anything on the translation services?

Mr. Di Santo: You are referring now to the two official languages?

Mr. Chairman: If you will remember, Mr. Di Santo, they do the two official languages, and they work in a number of other languages, as well.

Committee staffing? The members' lounge? Restaurants and cafeterias? Down to messenger services at the bottom of page four.

Mr. Boudria: Just for my own information, is this the point where we would make comments as to where some of these would apply to our operation?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. That is what we are doing this for.

Mr. Boudria: Or are we just approving that in so far as this is actually what happened over there?

Mr. Chairman: No. This report was prepared so that we might consider what we saw in conjunction with what we either have

here or do not have here, not to deal with the accuracy of the report per se.

Mr. Boudria: Thank you. Then I would have a point that I would like to raise at this time because it is one that was mentioned here, and it is also one on the agenda that relates to this item. That has to deal with the credit availability for members of the Legislature in the dining room.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest with respect that we hold that and deal with it separately as item two on the agenda for today?

Mr. Boudria: It is agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Messenger services, at the bottom of page four.

4 p.m.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, it does not affect very many of us; but some of us have offices outside of this building, and from time to time it is a little more difficult to get messenger service over in the Macdonald Block, where a number of us are than it is for members in this building.

I do not know if that is a matter for this committee to deal with, at least the parliamentary assistants who are in the ministry offices, when they want to get a messenger, it is not as easy as it is over here.

Mr. O'Neil: The opposition have been trying to get messengers.

Mr. Rotenberg: There are messengers attached to the Legislature, are there not?

Mr. O'Neil: Not that I am aware of. I know we have one fellow for our total caucus who works out of our leader's office. He has to work for 30 some members, and that is the only person we have.

Mr. Boudria:

He is a caucus person. He is not a legislative person per se, he is attached to the caucus, is he not?

Mr. Rotenberg: Not to get into it now, but on some future day we might look into the whole problem of messenger services.

Mr. Chairman: Some time we will look into it.

Mr. O'Neil: Right now would be an excellent time to look in to it.

Mr. Rotenberg: I think before we look into it, we should find out exactly what we have, what is on paper that we are supposed to have for messenger service, aside from having the pages when the House is sitting, who act as messengers for us as well. Sometimes the pages take something to the office now and bring it

back; that is part of the messenger services available.

Mr. Chairman: I understand the Sergeant at Arms may be able to provide some information on that and save delaying it.

Mr. Stelling: When the House is in session, the messenger service that comes under the control of the assembly is the pages and they offer you a limited service. They will do messages for you around the House, they will go to your office and they will bring some things from your office, maybe take something from your secretary to the House.

The other service that is available to you is operated by Government Services. There are five or six people you have probably seen who are usually standing outside the doors of committees. This is the only messenger service in the building. Personally, I have heard several comments about it. To me, it seems totally inadequate. I am one of those people who have been saying for the last couple of years that we should do something for the members to bring this situation into line with other major parliaments. If you compare the situation to the one in Ottawa, or the one in Quebec, you will see that we are totally undermanned in this area. I personally do not understand how members can get by with what they have.

Mr. O'Neil: As you say, I think we have just one person within our caucus, an older gentleman, who will deliver things for us whether they are within the building, or picking up something from one of the government agencies, or other things too.

Interjection.

Mr. O'Neil: No, he is not a part of that at all.

Mr. Rotenberg: Was he attached to the Legislature or is that somebody the Liberal Party handles?

Mr. O'Neil: I believe each party, each caucus has one person. I think it is something that should be looked into. Of course, another point that I often raise, a bone of contention--and I do not know whether you would consider it as part of a messenger service--is that I know the government members and ministers have cars and drivers at their disposal. In other words, I understand parliamentary assistants going out to make a speech somewhere have cars available from the pool to assist them.

The members who are not part of the government do not have anything like this at all. I often wonder whether, since we have certain commitments, there should be something looked into along that line so that we would have something from the government pool of drivers and cars when we are required to be certain places on government business, I should say connected with our roles.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want to file that as notice for an upcoming meeting?

Mr. O'Neil: Yes, I would.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Boudria: Just a couple of comments on the messenger service, having worked on the hill in Ottawa--

Mr. O'Neil: Pardon me, Mr. Boudria. I think on that particular thing that if we look into it, there would certainly have to be certain guidelines that would have to be established for the use of a driver or car that would be in a pool. I think it is something that I would like to have--

Mr. Chairman: Why don't we get a report back and then we will--

Mr. O'Neil: Sorry, Mr. Boudria.

Mr. Boudria: I only wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that having messenger system is something that would probably be very beneficial for us, however we have to watch that the system does not lead to abuse. As one who has worked in a jurisdiction where there are some 100 messengers all over the place, going to the cafeteria to get a glass of Pepsi for one of the secretaries is a little ridiculous. That is the point that it has got to in other jurisdictions.

Messengers are very convenient. If one member needs something, to pick up an envelope let us say in one of the government offices in the Macdonald Block, or one of those other buildings, it is a little inconvenient when you have to send your secretary, or go yourself. At the salary members are paid, I am sure we have better things to do than walk around picking up envelopes, and upon occasion you have to do that.

Mr. Rotenberg: Even plain brown envelopes you do not want to pick up yourself.

Mr. Boudria: That may be a little ridiculous that we have nothing.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we take that as notice and explore?

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps, but if we do, I do not think we would want to model anything that we do on what they have in Ottawa. I do think that is quite large, and costly, and does lead to abuse.

Mr. Chairman: Let us have--might I recommend--would it be agreeable to committee that Dr. O'Mara look into what messenger services are available now both within the context of the individual caucuses and provided through, in conjunction with the Sergeant at Arms? When we have that available we will see where we might go from there.

Mr. Watson: That information is all available from last session from this committee.

Mr. Chairman: We will have it brought forward then.

Mr. Boudria: Do they have any information on other jurisdictions?

Mr. Watson: No, but what each caucus had here, unless it has been changed--I know that we talked about it and it would be in the Hansard record.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure that Dr. O'Mara will begin with that as a base, and see if there are any changes to it.

Television broadcasting in Ottawa? Office accommodation for members and staff in Ottawa?

Mr. Di Santo: I want to make an observation. I thought the way it was organized in Ottawa, the service under the Sergeant at Arms, was pretty effective. I was wondering whether we can also give some consideration to doing the same here in Ontario. From an efficiency point of view and also from the services offered to the members, I wonder if it is feasible to change the role of the Sergeant at Arms. Right now it is rather downgraded in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Would you like to have Mr. Stelling's comments on that?

Mr. Stelling: I find it difficult to speak on a position like that. It is a little bit embarrassing.

Mr. Chairman: Aside from the personal view, would you agree with Mr. Di Santo that having these variety of services all reporting to the Sergeant at Arms may be more efficient than what we have here, in your professional opinion? That is really what all we need. We were not trying to put you on the spot.

Mr. Stelling: I would think so. One of the comments that was made--

Mr. Di Santo: I did not mean to do that.

Mr. Stelling: When the office of the Sergeant at Arms was being formed originally the idea was if you had a man sitting on the floor of the House, he was doing very little. This was in Britain. The idea was that you gave him something to do. It seemed the appropriate person to give duties that related directly to members because he was experiencing the same hours, some of the same problems that the members experienced. It seemed a very appropriate person to be doing that type of work. That goes back hundreds of years.

Mr. Di Santo: Except for the apartment in the building. We will not give that.

Mr. Chairman: Are you recommending that this committee recommend on to the Board of Internal Economy that the role of the Sergeant at Arms be expanded similar to its counterpart both in Westminster and Ottawa?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes, I do.

Mr. Watson: No.

Mr. Rotenberg: I would want what other duties are going to be imposed on the Sergeant at Arms to be spelled out exactly. I am not going to accept blindly what may be at some other location. I think those areas of responsibility that are recommended to go to the Sergeant at Arms should be indicated.

Mr. Chairman: If you have read the report, I am sure you will observe in it that all the duties are outlined in the various sections.

Mr. Rotenberg: One thing, for instance, number four which says allocation of offices is one of the jurisdictions of the Sergeant at Arms and I don't think that should be done. It is not done here and I would not support that as an example.

I think it should be spelled out specifically what--not just what is in this report, but--like messenger service, or whatever, what are going to be put under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Chairman: What do you feel should be put under?

Mr. Rotenberg: As a matter of fact, reflecting on the messenger service--when Mr. Boudria mentioned about the possible abuse of it--possibly interviewing the messenger service, whether it goes under the Sergeant at Arms or not, might be messengers allocated to each caucus rather than allocated generally, then there cannot be any complaints from one caucus overusing them as against another caucus.

4:10 p.m.

Mr. O'Neil: Do you have one messenger within your caucus or how do you handle it?

Mr. Rotenberg: I do not know how many there are. There are one or two who serve our caucus and one serves your caucus. But I think--

Mr. Boudria: Forty-six thousand of them.

Mr. Rotenberg: Whether they are under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms is--I think we are going to review messenger services before we say that should go under his jurisdiction. We should understand what we want to do with it first. I am not in favour of a blanket motion.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the motion?

Mr. Boudria: I think it is becoming apparent to some of us that whenever we try to do anything that will take away from what the government feels is its role in this Legislature, we seem to offend some members. It is particularly disturbing, for instance, when we were talking the other day about getting additional facilities for members, such as a lounge, that we get a

response from Bud Gregory, the Tory whip, telling us what we can or cannot have as members of this Legislature.

I cannot help but feel, and with all due respect because it is a majority situation in this committee as well as everywhere else of government members, but even some Conservative members on this committee must feel a little upset by this kind of action. It is fine to try to protect some of those people and I seem to detect that the member for Wilson Heights is doing that even at this moment, that any expansion of the role of the Sergeant at Arms is taking away from the role of somebody else in the government.

Maybe we do not want to have the Sergeant at Arms in charge of absolutely everything--the way it is in other places--but nevertheless, maybe it would be a good idea to have people with a bit more neutrality being in charge of the Legislature. The place would become less a department of the government. I feel that it is, to a certain degree, that way right now.

Mr. Rotenberg: First, the matter that came from the chief government whip was a request from this committee to use a room, which has already been assigned to the government caucus. That was under his jurisdiction already and it was a question whether he wanted to (inaudible). Yes, it has been assigned for whatever reason to the government caucus.

Mr. Boudria: By whom? By the government?

Mr. Rotenberg: By whoever assigns the rooms. It is now under his jurisdiction. That is why the reply came from him.

Mr. Di Santo: The request was that facility be transferred to the assembly.

Mr. Rotenberg: That was the request and the chief government whip said it is now in his jurisdiction and he wanted to keep it, which is a legitimate answer from him. If this committee as such or the Legislature wishes to request a reallocation of space that is something else. You asked the person who has it and he said, of course, he is not giving it up, the same as you would not want to give up your caucus room if you want it for a lounge.

Mr. Watson: What is wrong with that answer is you have an office in this building and that room is used by those who do not have offices in this building. I happen to be one of them. When I leave the Legislature and go to my office, it is a 10-minute trip.

Mr. Boudria: I do not think we are talking about the same office.

Mr. Rotenberg: We are talking about the room next door which is used by some of the government members who do not have offices in this building. They use that as an office away from their office.

Mr. Watson: I use it three or four times a week. Because when they are going into committee or coming it is a 10-minute trip. I think that Bud Gregory had every right to point out that

that room--whether there is another room or not--I am not in love with that particular room but there has to be one, in my opinion. Some of the ministers have sessional offices here. That is fine. Some of the parliamentary assistants with those ministers are doing that. Environment is one where the parliamentary assistant's office happens to be the minister's reception area for his sessional office here.

Mr. Rotenberg: If I may finish my answer, Mr. Chairman. I say that was the point on room 230, because it is now under the jurisdiction of the government whip. He, in effect, said from his point of view he wanted to keep it because it was being used.

As far as the general question about more powers for the Sergeant at Arms--I did not say I objected to them. I said the motion should not just say, "Give the Sergeant at Arms everything that other parliaments have," which was my understanding of the motion, but the motion would say specifically, "Those things that we recommend to the Board of Internal Economy, such as total messenger service, that we think the Sergeant at Arms should have as jurisdiction," and we will deal with the specific motion. I just said I did not want to deal with a general blanket motion that did not specify what should or should not be turned over to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Ruston: The whole problem with members' services and office accommodation--I do not know what the solution is. I know the power of government and wherever it might be, but having sat for eight years with the majority government and then five years in minority, the difference varied so much that it almost varied too much from one way to the other.

In my own case, when I was moved from where I had been up on the third floor, in a very lush, large office, maybe larger than we needed, but those were the rooms that were available so we took them. Then when we had to move to something else, for four months we had nothing where we could work. Everything was just piled up for four or five months. Other members of our caucus--and you may have them in yours, I don't know--go in what we call a hole in the wall. You walk in and back out.

I would like to have some independent person because we can argue here all day. We have political things and naturally one guy says, "It is only because you are in charge," and the other one says, "You are sitting on the opposite side, so suffer," or, "You are just ornery because you do not belong to the same party."

You have this going on for 14 years, but until some day we get somebody to come in and set up this whole building for offices for members so that each member has at least so many square feet and so many square feet for his assistant, we are going to have the same problem.

I do not know who is going to be that independent person. Maybe there is no such thing as independence in government. I suppose there is not, but there must be somebody who can lay the darn place out so that at least you would all be equal when you come in here. I know there is no such thing as being equal as far

as power goes but there should be equality when it comes to having facilities to carry out the job you have to do. You have a riding and a constituency to look after and you should be equal on that basis with everybody.

It is not equal. The way it has been done for 14 years is not right. I am sure you fellows would agree it is like the question period. We changed the rules in procedural affairs for five or six years. Now the rules are so that we thought we were doing a great thing, but they are hurting us more than anybody else. The main thing is the question period alone where 21 members have the same power as 34 as far as trying to get on in question period and things like that.

You make rules at the time according to the power and then the thing is to change. I can see your point in not wanting to change it because you fellows have recognised the third party as being the one to keep in power in order to keep in power yourselves. I understand that. I am not that stupid that I can't see that.

Mr. Kerr is a very fine gentleman and one of the best cabinet ministers ever. I have great respect for him, probably more respect than for anyone on the other side. I think he would agree with me that everybody should be entitled to the same size office and the same facilities as everybody else, no matter what party he belongs to. I do not know who is going to do that. Personally, I think I am just wasting my time in here because that is all we are doing.

Until we get someone to come in--and I do not know where you are going to get a neutral person. I think they are out there somewhere. I am pretty sure they are. Maybe we will need some former members, pick out three fellows who are well-respected former members to come into this Legislature and figure out what should be done. But personally, we are just wasting our time the way we are working on it now.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Di Santo, it was your motion originally that stimulated this debate and discussion. Do you want to do anything with your motion?

Mr. Di Santo: We are dealing with problems we should not deal with. I am one of the people who really does not care much about the lounge for the members, for instance. My colleagues were very upset with me because I voted in favour of closing down the lounge. I don't use it very much. I think the suggestion we had to request this room came from people from different parties including your caucus members who thought that perhaps at this time this room is not used very much.

I do not know to what extent it is used. I came there once in a while when somebody retired or the eightieth birthday of a former member, but that is it. So it was not really an attempt to subtract something from the Conservative caucus, at least in my mind and the minds of the people from your caucus who also suggested it.

I think in more general terms we should try to address the question the way Mr. Ruston addressed it and that is, we should finally come to terms with the problem that services for members should be decided here in the assembly, not by the government and the member should not be dependent on the decisions made by the government. Unfortunately, in Ontario we have a situation where your party has been the government for 40 years, so in the back of your mind you think you will be the government forever.

Mr. Rotenberg: Not forever; just another 40 years.

Mr. Di Santo: Another 40 years. I think that does not make justice to the members and does not make justice to your caucus as well. With my motion, I meant to create a neutral area where the Sergeant at Arms--it could be something else. I do not have a magic solution, something which would supervise some services without giving the impression it has to be the government that provides those services for the members, services of the assembly.

If you want to know what specific services, I do not know, but I can change my motion if you want and we can perhaps give more thought to what general services should be--

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Di Santo, would you like Dr. O'Mara to develop a report on what other jurisdictions may do?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes, what kind of jurisdiction can be created for the Sergeant at Arms, perhaps getting a little closer to Ottawa and Westminster.

Mr. Boudria: One last remark: Many of the government members should be even more offended at some of the ways things are done here--for example, when we visited the offices the other day and found people who are handing out medals or handing out awards, or whatever they did, and are located in this building, and you as members of this Legislature do not even have an office in this building while there are public servants all over the place. Those people should be shipped out and you people should have an office here and you would not require that room on the other side.

To have an independent body do things like assign offices would be even more to your benefit than it is to us. We already have an office here and many of you do not even have that. Think about it some time.

Mr. O'Neil: A lot of them do not want offices here because some of the offices you have are pretty nice where you are.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Di Santo moves that we do a further report through Dr. O'Mara on the possibility of including other services for the Legislative Assembly under the Sergeant at Arms.

Motion agreed to.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: On page six, expansion of restaurants and cafeterias in Ottawa, is there anything on that besides item two on the actual (inaudible) agenda?

Mr. Watson: I think we should have a postscript on that on what the new income tax regulations are going to be, how that is going to change things. It should be very interesting. Who do they charge it to and how do you know how much we ate. I think it would be very interesting if anybody had any information on how they plan to work that.

Mr Ruston: We will have to look at it here.

Mr. Boudria: With all due respect, anybody who says that the meals here are subsidized, they may be subsidized because they do not make money, but that is not to say they are subsidized in comparison to what they are outside. For instance, you can go to an outside restaurant and eat just as cheaply as you do here, whereas in Ottawa it is cheaper than the comparable price outside. They still make a deficit here, mind you, but there may be other reasons why deficits are made.

Interjections.

Mr. Rotenberg: The liquor prices are cheaper.

Mr. Boudria: Than what?

Mr. Rotenberg: Here.

Mr. Boudria: Do you mean in the building?

Mr. Rotenberg: The liquor prices downstairs are cheaper than across at the Sutton Place or some other place.

Mr. Boudria: You are not in the Sutton Place; you are in a hole in the basement.

Mr. Rotenberg: Even the local bar.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on restaurants and cafeterias in Ottawa? Does anybody have any final comment on the Ottawa portion before we move on to the Quebec City portion?

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: The National Assembly of the province of Quebec. Secretarial assistance to members.

Mr. O'Neil: Where did we leave off? I think we passed a resolution a couple of weeks ago about additional assistance for the members, whether it was research assistance or whether that would come under this section.

Mr. Chairman: The item was up. Mr. Clerk, do you recall the disposition of that?

Mr. McLean: We voted on that.

Mr. Chairman: I think it was rejected on a vote the last time we met.

Mr. O'Neil: It was.

Mr. Chairman: Hold on to that, Mr. O'Neil, and I will have the clerk pull the record.

Page eight, the messenger service in Quebec. The National Assembly library. Members' offices.

Mr. Di Santo: They are spending \$110,000 to remodel the offices. Perhaps we should not spend that much, but at least try to do something for our offices because there are still members with offices without windows, located on the second floor in the north wing. As Mr. Boudria said, we have offices occupied by civil servants that could be located outside the main assembly building. I think we should really take a serious look at this.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want to make a motion to that effect?

Mr. Di Santo: I want to make a motion. Even though this is an ongoing problem--it is not a new problem--I hope we start seriously studying this problem. We should make a recommendation to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Chairman: That consideration be given to reducing the number of civil servants or, more specifically, the number of square feet they have in this building and providing better office facilities for the members of the Legislature?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: You want to recommend that right on to the Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I am just asking, just so I understand your motion. Any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Kerr: Do you mean those connected with the Speaker's office and people like that?

Mr. Boudria: No, government employees.

Interjection.

Mr. McLean: I think what we need is a study of who all are in the building.

Interjections.

Mr. O'Neil: I think that is a good idea. It would be nice to know who is in the building.

Mr. Rotenberg: The Clerk's staff have been moved across the street, haven't they, into the Whitney Block?

Mr. Boudria: They should come back in.

An non. member: There are very few civil servants left in the building.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Di Santo, would you be recommending a project for Dr. O'Mara to find out how many civil servants are in this building and what kind of square footage they take up?

Mr. Rotenberg: Who is in this building altogether.

Mr. Chairman: Who occupies this building.

Interjections.

Mr. Di Santo: And who may be located elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman: Does everybody have the gist of the motion at this point, that Dr. O'Mara prepare a report outlining who is located in this building and what services, with a view to possibly reducing the number of civil servants and support staff in favour of better office accommodation for the members? That is the motion.

Mr. Di Santo: We may also move the Lieutenant Governor into a hotel as in Saskatchewan.

Interjections.

Mr. Rotenberg: He did. The Liberals tore it down in 1937.

Mr. Boudria: Could we also include in that report, in the opinion of Dr. O'Mara, would there be people who are not at present located in this building who should be?

Mr. Chairman: Oh, that is a big job.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: I refer to only one example and you can judge it on that one. It is the business of the clerks of the committees being located in another building.

Mr. Rotenberg: I don't think our researcher can give us opinions as to who should or should not be in the building. He can only give us facts.

Mr. Chairman: Everyone has heard the motion. Those in favour of Mr. Di Santo's motion. Those opposed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Committee rooms, page nine. The bookstore. Hostess services. The press gallery.

Mr. Ruston: That is an interesting one, Mr. Chairman. The

press people have a space on the third floor and some on the fourth floor and yet in Quebec they have very limited space in the main building. Everything is far into this other building with this computer that feeds information over to them within 20 minutes, typed out and everything. I don't know if we should be supplying the main part of the building here for that purpose. I don't think that is our job.

Mr. Kerr: You are not including the press lounge, I hope.

Mr. Ruston: Well, I am including it all.

Mr. Kerr: You want to move the press lounge out?

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, this gets back to the previous motion of Mr. Di Santo, which will cover it. A good chunk of the third floor is covered by the press gallery with offices all over the place. With respect, Mr. Ruston, good luck, if we can all get together as a group and do something about it.

Mr. Chairman: That will come in with the report.

Mr. Ruston: This is one of the things I was quite concerned about, seeing they have the choice rooms in this building.

Mr. Rotenberg: You are right, but who is going to bell the cat?

Mr. Ruston: I will be the first one to lead if anyone else wants to follow.

Mr. Chairman: Hansard, page 11.

Mr. O'Neil: I have a question. I know the volume of work they have, but I question the amount of time it takes on the estimates in getting Hansard. What does it take now?

Mr. Chairman: We would have to get Mr. Brannan down if you want facts. It is about a week, the same as for committees.

Mr. O'Neil: At least that. I question that because there are times I would like to get copies of Instant Hansard on the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: We would have to bring Mr. Brannan before the committee to speak to that.

Mr. O'Neil: I would like to receive some information on that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. O'Neil moves that this item be held, and the matter of the time lag between the meetings of committees and estimates and the delivery of the transcript be explored further.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Radio, television, broadcasting services.

Mr. Boudria: You have carried that item, not the whole of Hansard.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Do you have further comments on the Hansard section in Quebec?

Mr. Boudria: I know that some of the staff of Hansard went to Quebec City after our visit to study what was supposed to be impossible before we went there, that is, the transcription of the text in both languages. I understand we sent a number of people over there. One of the Hansard employees told me he went there himself. I would like to know if Mr. Brannan would tell us what happened there. Did they determine that there was available by that trip?

Mr. Chairman: The second part of the motion then would be to ask Mr. Brannan to describe the results of the visit of his staff to the Hansard service in the National Assembly of Quebec.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment? I was in Nova Scotia a year or so ago. The Hansard reports there were lengthy, but the next morning when you went there, they were all on your desk, typed and printed. It was fantastic. I think ours need a real update here.

Mr. Chairman: It does seem time to see Mr. Brannan again.

Those in favour of Mr. Boudria's motion regarding Hansard.  
Those opposed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Radio, television, broadcasting and tape duplicating services in Quebec.

Mr. Rotenberg: How they handle their television?

Mr. Chairman: That seems appropriate.

Mr. O'Neill: In taping some of these conversations, and I suppose it goes back to Hansard so maybe we could include that as part of that motion, I know I have experienced the odd occasion when something that has been said in the legislature I have heard back in the riding on the radio station. The actual taping of what took place in the legislature has been relayed to one of the radio stations. Again, maybe we could ask Hansard, if we do get up in the legislature and make a certain comment, whether that is available so that we could use it to forward it on to our radio station or something like that.

Mr. Rotenberg: The radio stations themselves do their own taping here. There is Broadcast News Service. What you get on your tapes in the various radio stations I understand is totally independent of Hansard. That is done by the press gallery and the other media.

Mr. O'Neil: You are sure now. I would like to know that for certain.

Mr. Rotenberg: Yes. That is done by the press gallery.

Mr. O'Neil: This particular case was where a member of this Legislature played that as part of a news broadcast back.

Mr. Rotenberg: From the Hansard tape?

Mr. O'Neil: I do not know.

Mr. Rotenberg: I would be very doubtful it would be from the Hansard tape.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. O'Neil, when Mr. Brannan is here I am sure he will be able to speak to that.

Mr. O'Neil: He should be advised that will be one of the questions.

Mr. Watson: That comes from the studio. They can plug in and report.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Richardson, I am sure, will make that known to him.

Mr. O'Neil: It would be a service that could be provided for the members. I would like to know more about it.

Mr. Boudria: I would like to ask a question on that, Mr. Chairman. We see that in the federal House they broadcast question period live on television. We are not equipped for that in this Legislature. As we have seen in Quebec City and Ottawa, it would be very expensive to do that. They have done it, but despite the fact that I think we should increase a lot of facilities to members, I think that would be very expensive here.

Having said that, would it not be possible for this province, and I do not know if it is in the mandate of this committee to recommend it, that question period here could be recorded in some way and transmitted by TVOntario? Why is it when you turn on television you see the Quebec National Assembly, city council and Ottawa, usually in that order?

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Chairman, I think it is the cable companies themselves. The cable companies in the various boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto, like North York and York, show theirs. Really, I think it is a matter for the cable companies. If they want to come in here and film question period, away they go.

Mr. Boudria: No, that was not my question. I was not talking about cable.

Mr. Rotenberg: I am talking about the cable company. In Toronto the various city council meetings are shown on private cable. Some are live. Toronto, York and North York are the three I

know of that are live, and I think Scarborough does it too. That is done by the cable companies coming into the chambers.

In Ottawa they have the whole setup to do it and farm it out. This was discussed, I believe, by the Speaker's office three or four years ago when I was Deputy Chairman--we, as the Legislature, providing the facilities and in effect doing the taping and farming it out to the cable companies. The cost is prohibitive for us doing it, compared to what the market would be out there.

Mr. Boudria: I already said that in my preamble. Having said that, I was just wondering if it would not be possible to televise at least question period by the same mechanism that the constitutional debate was done and transmitted. TVOntario is supposed to be there for exactly that purpose.

Mr. Rotenberg: That was what was discussed, taping just question period. We would have to put in all kinds of facilities here. We would have to do it as distinct from the cable companies or the private TV networks that come in here and pay for their facilities. Whether you are doing it for an hour a day or six hours a day, the cost of setting it up is the same. The actual running time is not all that much once you have put up a facility in here. It was millions of dollars to put in the facilities. I cannot remember. It was a great cost to put in the facilities. If you want, there was a report done about three or four years ago by the Speaker's office. Maybe we should get that first and have a look at that and see where we go from there. There is a report already out somewhere, I believe.

Mr. Boudria: I will agree to that, Mr. Chairman. The only point I wanted to make is if it is possible, for instance, to install those two little stands in the Legislature for the budget debate, why it is not possible to have that on an ongoing basis? Why do we need all these fancy studios? We do not have to have the setup they have in Ottawa and Quebec City. I do not advocate anything that fancy and that is probably what that report talks about, but I have not read it.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. Rotenberg: We do not do them. The cable companies come in and televise the budget debate. While we supply the stands they supply the facilities. There would be no problem if the TV companies--Rogers Cable which has most of Metro now as an example--wanted to come in and televise the question period and send it out live as they do at Toronto city hall and North York city council, I think we could give them the stands. They have not asked us yet. But you want TVOntario to do it.

Mr. Boudria: You are really answering my question. You are saying it is possible and easy for Rogers to do it, but it is impossible for anybody else to do it because it would be too expensive.

Mr. Rotenberg: No. I am saying if a private cable company--CBC, CTV or whoever--want to come in and do it, the minimum facilities are there for them to bring in their equipment,

but if we as a government or a Legislature got into buying our own equipment to do it, process the film and then farm it out, that is where the great expense comes in. They have all their equipment already.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. If I may say so the cameras are the cheapest part. What you see is the cheapest part of the whole operation. They have a \$1-million control and fluctuation and distribution setup sitting outside.

Mr. Rotenberg: What the Speaker did, and I think it was in a written report about three or four years ago when this whole matter came up once before and Mr. Stokes was Speaker, I think somewhere we should be able to get--either in the Speaker's office or the Clerk's office--a copy of that report and then we can take it from there.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, one of the things I note in this report is that in Quebec City there have been no complaints about the glare. Just for the record I would like to complain about the glare from the lights we have in there now. I particularly am annoyed with the glare when the lights are on and there are no cameras. It is one of my pet peeves.

Mr. Di Santo: We noticed.

Mr. Watson: Do the lights not bother you on that side?

Mr. Boudria: No. Not me anyway.

Mr. Stelling: The present lighting we have now is not owned by the assembly. It is owned by CBC and it was placed up there about five or six years ago as an experiment only. They placed it that way to get an idea of how they could get lighting on the floor. Considering it was only an experiment it seems to me that five years is adequate to decide whether that is the proper type of lighting or not. It is not our system, it is the CBC's.

Mr. Kerr: They must need it though or they would not--

Mr. Stelling: I am not too sure whether they know we still have it.

Mr. Kerr: Is that the lighting system that is used every day?

Mr. Stelling: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Is it agreeable then that Dr. O'Mara, who is going to be busy and will be absent from this committee for the first time, will also look into the matter of the technical report both on the lighting and on the TVO proposal and report back on that as well?

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: We are completely without bias, right? That gets us through that.

Thank you to Mr. Arnott and Mr. White for preparing that synopsis which proved to be very helpful indeed.

MEMBERS' DINING ROOM

Mr. Chairman: You will notice that behind that report there is a confidential report which I propose to deal with as item three. If we could turn our attention to item two which is the report on the feasibility of extending credit privileges in the members' dining room. Ms. Beech is here with us this afternoon. Does everybody have a copy of the report? Has everyone seen this report before? Mr. Richardson, was this report distributed before?

Clerk of the Committee: Only to those who were present last week.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Beech, would you like to give us a brief summary of the conclusions that you reached in looking into this matter on your report?

Ms. Beech: As I discussed with Mr. Perry, if we have to choose between one of the two methods after investigating both, the only practical one would be the signing privileges. The credit card just does not seem feasible whatsoever. There is the time consumption it would take, both at the cash register and in the number of trips to the bank. Every credit card requires a different bank. A separate gratuity system would have to be set up for gratuities from credit cards versus gratuities from signing privileges as well as the cash flow, which in all would take a matter of a month, estimating a month, for gratuities to return to the person involved at the time of the service. So either must be chosen. Signing is the only one although it also is time consuming. It is the only practical way.

Mr. Boudria: I would think as well, Mr. Chairman, that signing is better. If we start with credit cards, then anybody who comes into the dining room would potentially be allowed to use his credit card. I do feel it would be convenient for members to have signing if we have unexpected guests from our constituency and they come in nine at a time. It is sometimes almost embarrassing if you are in that particular situation.

I feel that the credit cards would lead to everybody using them and I do not really think that we are advocating here that that would be necessary. I think it would be nice for all the members of the Legislature, but not necessarily for the public servant who works three blocks away and decides he wants to come and charge his lunch. That may not be what we want.

Mr. O'Neil: I do not believe we should have any type of credit whatsoever. I think we should be prepared, when we go in there, to pay for our meals. I have experienced the same thing as Mr. Boudria where I have had people come in, and being of limited finances I have had to go to other members. I have also had the experience where I have been short of money and I know the dining room has said, "Pay us tomorrow," in the case of an emergency. I do not believe we should get into any of this credit stuff whatsoever.

I do not think it is needed. You can pick a few dollars up from somebody else or, of necessity, charge it and pay them the next morning or later on in the day. I do not think we should get into it.

Ms. Beech: If I may say, Mr. Chairman, we try to accommodate when emergencies arise. We do not mind that. It is very embarrassing for us in the dining room to have to chase someone for a \$1.25 check because he does not have \$1.25 in his pocket. We do not mind if someone brings in guests and he is caught short. I can appreciate the situation you are in if people arrive in your office. I do not mind it on an occasional basis, but it is the day-to-day, habitual signing for one check. "I forgot my wallet, I don't have the money in my pocket, can I come back later?" Consequently, from time to time, we have had to go to get the money a week later.

Mr. O'Neil: Look at what you would have, Mr. Chairman, if you had a large percentage of the people charging. You are going to have to chase some of these accounts again. I just do not think we should get into it at all.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Boudria has a suggestion and I offer one from the chair as well. Is there any merit to being able to sign if you are more than one? In other words, having to pay cash if you are eating on your own, but if you do find yourself in an unexpected situation with other people--

Mr. O'Neil: Again, you are getting into a hornet's nest.

Mr. Chairman: I realize your status financially may be somewhat different than mine, maybe because you never use credit. But I wondered whether or not there is some way of accommodating on a more formal or more regulated basis a situation where you do find yourself with a number of guests.

Mr. Watson: Do you ever accept cheques?

Ms. Beech: My instructions from the Legislative Assembly office are that there are no cheques allowed. Again, we have made exceptions to that rule. If someone comes in with 10 guests and the bill may come to \$100, as opposed to me holding on to a check for \$100, I will then accept a cheque with the member's signature.

Mr. O'Neil: That might be a good idea.

Mr. Watson: The problem with cheques is a matter of identification and the people there know the members.

Mr. Boudria: That was exactly my suggestion. Why not accept a cheque from a member? That would be the rule. Members are allowed to give a cheque. So if we come in with nine guests, we will just make out a cheque. Of course, you do not make out a cheque when you eat for \$2. You do not do that any place else and you would not do it here either. But if you come in with a whole bunch of guests you would then at that point, if it is deemed advisable because of the financial situation, use a cheque.

That is ordinary in any other kind of business. I don't suppose that tomorrow the supervisor would see herself with 33 cheques, because it is just not done--it is just not feasible.

Mr. Chairman: Can we make the recommendation then that a member may pay by cheque when he is entertaining guests in the members' dining room?

Mr. Boudria: Could we elaborate on that? The member may pay by personal cheque for the exact amount of the purchase. In other words, he wouldn't go there to cash a cheque. That may lead to abuse. He is allowed a personal cheque for the amount purchased.

Mr. McLean: A member entertaining guests in the dining room may pay by personal cheque.

Mr. Chairman: We would have to make a recommendation to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Kerr: What is the proper name? Is it the members' dining room?

Ms. Beech: The legislative dining room.

Mr. Kerr: One thing rubs me the wrong way, that deputy ministers have signing privileges and members of the Legislature do not. I also note that deputy ministers use the ministers' dining room, and I assume that private members don't--no government members.

Mr. Chairman: You could move that as well.

Mr. Kerr: The idea of that dining room, I would think initially, was to have eating facilities for members, particularly members who happen to stay in town all week. I know a deputy minister makes a hell of a lot more money than we do, but the idea that he has signing privileges makes you wonder what the purpose of the dining room is. I just want that to be on the record.

Mr. Ruston: Good idea, George.

Mr. Chairman: Are you moving to rescind the deputy minister's dining privileges then--their use of the cabinet dining room?

Mr. Kerr: Let them stay. They are probably keeping the thing in a proper position.

Mr. Chairman: The motion has been made recommending to the Board of Internal Economy that members entertaining guests in the legislative dining room be permitted to pay their bills by personal cheque.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Might I indicate to the committee that we have dealt with item two. We are on to other business and Mr. O'Neil has indicated--

Mr. O'Neil: I have made this point a couple of times when Mr. Perry was here, I know. They have something on the menu that says "sandwich, roast of the day."

Ms. Beech: Which we are trying to deal with, Mr. O'Neil, definitely.

Mr. O'Neil: I know that twice this week I have been told it is--

An hon. member: Peanut butter?

Mr. O'Neil: It is either ham, and that is the sliced ham that comes out of a package, or corned beef. I really--

Ms. Beech: I will look into that. That's not the case.

Mr. O'Neil: There are lots of times that I would like to go into the dining room at noon just to have a sandwich--have a sandwich off the roast of something.

I must say too that I find the salad bar extremely good--

Ms. Beech: It is very popular.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else under new business?

Mr. McLean: Why are the prices in the cafeteria so much less than the ones in the legislative dining room?

Mr. Kerr: Because you don't get fresh sandwiches in the cafeteria.

Ms. Beech: Mr. Kerr, we make those sandwiches in the dining room.

Mr. Kerr: Do you?

Ms. Beech: Yes.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me the staff is being subsidized and the members are paying close to the going rate. Can you speak to the disparity of pricing, or do you want to leave--

Ms. Beech: No, I'd rather let Mr. Perry. He does the pricing.

Mr. Chairman: You will take that as notice?

Mr. O'Neil: I feel the dining room staff and the staff of the cafeteria work for us every day, all year long, and yet when we hold a do like the one last night those people are not part of the Speaker's party. They are still there working. I would like to ask for consideration of some type of outside catering for the Speaker's party next year so the staff who work in the dining room

and the cafeteria will be included as part of the guests for the Speaker's party.

Mr. Chairman: That's very generous of you.

Ms. Beech: If I may interject, it was a very nice suggestion, but the Speaker does take our staff out on a separate occasion. This was an arrangement made the year before last because we were invited at the same time as we had to cater to it. We said we would prefer to do it since it is in our building and we know everyone who is here. We enjoy the socializing even though we are working, and the Speaker does take us out one evening following Christmas.

Mr. O'Neil: So you are quite happy with that.

Ms. Beech: We are quite happy.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Speaker should take out those other people who worked in the food service process last night as well.

Ms. Beech: That was a generous offer.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything else before we go into camera? Thank you, Bonnie. Thank you, everyone.

The sitting continued in camera at 4:57 p.m.











AUG 13 1986

3 1761 11468364 2

